

metered permits without stamps affixed, must discontinue dropping such mail in the Bossier branch office but deliver it to the rear platform of the Shreveport office under an order received from Arthur L. Layton, acting postmaster of the Shreveport post office.

Hard hit by this new post office procedure ruling, which comes on the heels of Mr. E. W. Roderick's farcical hearing in Bossier City, will be the larger churches. At least two churches, the First Baptist and the Barksdale Baptist Church, will be affected and others are thought to be affected.

The chamber of commerce received its notice Friday. Bob Croft, manager, reported that the chamber sends out from 350 to 700 pieces of bulletin mail each month, and that he had been depositing such mail at the local post office. A report from the First Baptist Church was that such mail was handled in the same manner.

The bulletin from Layton reads as follows:

"NOTICE TO PERMIT MAILERS—MATTER WITHOUT STAMPS AFFIXED

"Under revised postal procedures you will receive a receipt for mailings made under your nonmeter permit only if you request receipt and furnish an additional copy of Form 3602, Statement of Mailing, which the weigher will verify, initial, and deliver to you.

"Under the new postal procedures instructions the permit holder must deliver his permit imprint mail at the place where the ledger records or permit accounts are maintained. Those records are maintained only at the rear platform, main post office.

"ARTHUR L. LAYTON,  
"Acting Postmaster."

This is only one of a number of strong articles written by the press of Bossier City indicating the interest which these people have in a separate office. The Planters Press in Bossier City has been very active on behalf of a separate and independent office. A number of articles have appeared in this fine paper aggressively demanding that the people be given proper recognition of their application for a separate and independent Bossier City office. I do not have these articles before me for use at the present time but at some later date I will have an opportunity to give these articles to the Congress.

I can see no reason why there should not be an independent post office for Bossier. Not only is Bossier the seventh

largest city in Louisiana in population but it also originates a tremendous amount of postal business. A separate office will give this community the pride which should properly be theirs in having a post office named for this great center. The cost of the office will add nothing to the postal deficit. It can be done and handled in such a way as to cost practically no additional amount.

I think the Post Office Department has been inactive long enough. Some action is due and the plea of these people, who contribute so heavily to our Government, should not be overlooked or cast aside. I hope the Postmaster General will personally see this insertion in the RECORD and will act immediately in approving a separate and independent office for Bossier City.

### Expatriated Citizens

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 5186, which provides for certified copies of citizenship to be furnished to repatriated American citizens who voted in an Italian election or plebiscite during the years 1946 and 1948.

Under the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act, those citizens who so voted may be repatriated under certain conditions, but under the provisions of law they are not entitled to certified copies of their citizenship once repatriated. There are now thousands of persons awaiting this documentation which would enable them to be registered voters, or to qualify for employment where citizenship is essential, and for countless other activities in which positive American citizenship must be established.

There appears to me to be excellent justification and a basis for this legislation caused by the recollection that great numbers of prominent and nationally known groups and civic organizations put on a tremendous campaign between 1946 and 1948, for American citizens in Italy, to cast a vote against the Communist candidates in these elections and plebiscites.

Through the dissemination of millions of letters, telegrams and circulars and other material to Italy, the Christian Democrat Party led by Alcide de Gasperi was able to defeat the Communist and other radical left wing parties in the opposition and preserve Italy to the free world. One such organization in the United States, the Order Sons of Italy, during its annual convention in California in 1946, was one of the spearheads in the nationwide efforts to defeat the Italian Communists. Many thousands of dollars contributed by this organization and its members were used during these 2 years to contact friends, relatives, and countrymen and urge them to cast a vote against the Communist candidate.

There were also many broadcasts made to Italy during this time as a direct appeal to Americans to vote in the elections. Certain officials of the United States Government did, in fact, appear on these broadcasts in strong support of this move.

Following such action, those who had participated in these elections lost their American rights but they were later repatriated by legislative action. My bill would enable repatriated citizens to obtain upon request, an exact copy of the certificates of citizenship which are supplied to the Department of Justice and State Department. This would end a great deal of confusion which exists today for these people, and would entitle them upon request to immediate documentary proof furnished by our Government of their American nationality.

I trust that the appropriate committee to which this legislation will be referred will take immediate action and that this legislation will receive the wholehearted support of my colleagues.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and glory, in these days thrilling and throbbing with the loveliness of spring, we thank Thee for every sacrament of beauty of which our enraptured senses drink as we bend in wonder at the petaled cups held up by bushes aflame with Thee. May the glory of the earth be but a parable of the things that are excellent, blooming in our risen lives.

Lead us out of the bondage of fear and hate into Thy new day when earth's

wildernesses shall blossom as the rose and when, in a better order of human society, pity and plenty and laughter shall return to the common ways of man.

"God, the All-righteous One, man hath defied Thee;

Yet to eternity standeth Thy word;  
Falsehood and wrong shall not tarry beside Thee;

Give to us peace in our time, O Lord!"  
Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D. C., March 24, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to per-

form the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. MONRONEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 23, 1955, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 23, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 942)

to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold."

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4647. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4941. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4647. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 4941. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### REPORT ON APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATION FOR TAX COURT

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D. C., reporting that the appropriation to the Tax Court of the United States for "Salaries and expenses" for the fiscal year 1955 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

##### ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of several displaced persons from reports heretofore transmitted to the Senate, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### AUDIT REPORT ON VETERANS' CANTEEN SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

##### FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial statement of the Legion, for the period ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

##### REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, and constituent agencies, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration, for the calendar year 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT RELATING TO PROTESTS OF GRANTS OF INSTRUMENTS OF AUTHORIZATION WITHOUT HEARING

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

##### INCREASED CONTRIBUTION TO BUREAU OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

##### "House Concurrent Resolution 19

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national monument on Blennerhassett Island

"Whereas Blennerhassett Island in the Ohio River near Parkersburg, W. Va., is a place of historic interest in that it played an important part in the life and intrigues of Aaron Burr, former Vice President of the United States, and is a place of scenic beauty; and

"Whereas the island is now in private hands with little or nothing being done to preserve it as a permanent place of historic interest for future generations of Americans, but is in danger of losing its identity as a historic site: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to give favorable consideration to the passage of legislation that would establish Blennerhassett Island as a national monument, and which would include the reconstruction of the Blennerhassett Mansion and build an adequate approach to the island by bridge or ferry; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this concurrent resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, and Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress in favor of the immediate passage of legislation for the development of fine arts programs and projects

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill to provide for the establishment of a program of Federal grants for the development of fine arts programs and projects; and

"Whereas the enactment of such legislation would be to the advantage of this Commonwealth: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment of a program of Federal grants for the development of fine arts programs and projects; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

##### "Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution reaffirming equal rights of all citizens of the United States and of Utah and congratulating President Dwight David Eisenhower and Congress and the Supreme Court for accomplishments upon this subject

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

"Whereas the Government of the United States, through its legislative, judicial, and

executive departments, is making great strides toward the fulfillment of the American dream that equal rights be accorded to all citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas citizens of so-called minority groups have and are continuing to distinguish themselves in all fields of endeavor, and especially in Government, science, art, music, the theater, industry, and in athletic efforts; and

"Whereas the principles of equal rights, which are declared to be self-evidence in our Declaration of Independence, and which are guaranteed by the Constitution of this great country, and which are also stated in the Constitution of our own State; and

"Whereas America's future greatness may depend in part upon the ability of all of her citizens to harmoniously live and work and fight together to meet the challenges of any foe or adversary, from within or without our shores: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the people of Utah, through their legislature, in session assembled, be cognizant and mindful of the fundamental rights and privileges guaranteed to all citizens of this great State; and be it further

*Resolved*, That President Dwight David Eisenhower, the Congress, and the Supreme Court be complemented for the progress which has been realized during the past 2 years to help guarantee and perpetuate, to all citizens, equal rights in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; be it further

*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the President and Vice President of the United States of America, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, and the four members of the congressional delegation from Utah."

A resolution adopted by the 48th annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, favoring the enactment of legislation which will secure to the States the power and right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory tax imposed under the protection and authority of the law of any State, Territory, or possession; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Louisiana Department of Public Welfare, Baton Rouge, La., signed by Edward P. Dameron, commissioner of public welfare, remonstrating against certain proposed amendments to the social-security laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Veterans of Military Intelligence Service, Honolulu, T. H., signed by Daniel T. Nishimura, president, enclosing a resolution adopted by that organization, favoring the enactment of House bill 588, to establish an educational-assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Asociación Pro Protección de la Raza, of Ponce, Puerto Rico, signed by Ismaro Torruella, president, praying for the enactment of legislation to combat juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Harbor Commission of the Port of San Diego, Calif., signed by John Bate, port director, enclosing a resolution adopted by that commission, relating to maintenance of navigable waterways and harbors; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Niagara County, N. Y., protesting against a revision of the plan of the Corps of Engineers for the redevelopment

of power from the waters of the Niagara River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

#### "Senate Joint Memorial 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation prohibiting the seeding of clouds or the use of other methods of inducing rain or snowfall until sufficient scientific data are collected to make other effective regulation possible

"Whereas the uncontrolled and indiscriminate efforts of many groups and persons to modify climates and induce changes in meteorological causes and effects by the use of chemical and physical devices such as cloud-seeding has had unforeseen and adverse effects upon many localities; and

"Whereas there exists no legal, scientific, or physical means by which the effects of chemically or physically induced precipitation, can be accurately gaged or controlled; and

"Whereas sought-for beneficial effects of such artificial rain-making have often not materialized and the effects induced have often been prejudicial and harmful: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is respectfully urged to enact legislation prohibiting the use of cloud-seeding or other techniques to induce precipitation by artificial means until such time as scientific data and the establishment of administrative controls permit the adequate regulation by Congress of various means of climate control; and be it further

*Resolved*, That enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from New Mexico.

"JOE M. MONTAÑA,  
President, Senate.

"EDWARD G. ROMERO,  
Chief Clerk, Senate.

"DONALD D. HALLAM,  
Speaker, House of Representatives.

"FLOYD CROSS,  
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 7th day of March 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,  
Governor, State of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

#### "Senate Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to commend by joint resolution the purposes of the memorial to the American Indian Foundation in establishing a national living memorial to the American Indian in the State of New Mexico

"Whereas there is at the present time no national living memorial to the American Indian commensurate with the great debt our Nation owes to the first inhabitants of this great Nation; and

"Whereas there has been chartered by the State of Michigan a nonprofit corporation named the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation, for the purposes of constructing such a memorial as conceived by sculptor E. Harlan Daniels; and

"Whereas the memorial, so conceived, shall forever acknowledge the contribution made to our Nation by these first American citizens, shall enlighten the American people on a civilization that is basic to our American

heritage, and shall foster the collection and preservation of relics, artifacts, and documented knowledge of the Indian race in America; and

"Whereas the board of trustees of the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation has by resolution dedicated the foundation to the placement of the memorial in the State of New Mexico, and has received assurances of support from various prominent citizens and civic organizations in said State: Now, therefore be it

*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to enact a joint resolution commending the purposes of the memorial to the American Indian Foundation in the furtherance of this great project; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from New Mexico.

"JOE M. MONTAÑA,  
President, Senate.

"EDWARD G. ROMERO,  
Chief Clerk, Senate.

"DONALD D. HALLAM,  
Speaker, House of Representatives.

"FLOYD CROSS,  
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.  
Approved by me this 16th day of March, 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,  
Governor, State of New Mexico."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

#### "House Resolution 2

"Resolution of the House of Representatives of the 22d Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the Colorado River storage project

*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico (the Governor concurring herein):*

"Whereas the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries have by compact, approved by the Legislatures of the State of Arizona, California, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, and Wyoming, been allocated to these several States, and said compact having been approved by the Congress of the United States in 1922; and

"Whereas the upper basin States, consisting of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, through the Upper Colorado River Commission and the legislatures of said States and with the approval of Congress, have allocated their proportionate share of the water of said river among themselves; and

"Whereas the conservation and wise use of water of the Colorado River can only be made possible by the construction of strategic storage facilities on said river and its tributaries; and

"Whereas the conservation and wise use of water is of foremost importance to the future agricultural and economic development and the general welfare of the Western United States and of the United States; and

"Whereas the Upper Colorado River Commission, working in conjunction with the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, has developed a plan, known as the Colorado River storage project, to permit the conservation and wise use of the waters of the Colorado River in the upper basin States; and

"Whereas said Colorado River storage project has been developed after many years of investigation, planning, and on-the-ground surveys of the storage facilities of the upper Colorado River and its tributaries; and

"Whereas said Colorado River storage project has been determined to be the most economical and feasible method of storing

and using said waters for the benefit of both the upper and lower basin States; and

"Whereas the storage of water as proposed in the Colorado River storage project is vital to permit the upper basin States to meet their commitments to the lower basin States under the compact of 1922, and to have available the upper basin States' allotment of water as provided in said compact; and

"Whereas to carry out the intent and purposes of the several compacts approved by the legislatures of the several States concerned, and to carry out the purposes and intent of said compacts as approved by Congresses of the United States, the authorization of the Colorado River storage project by the 84th Congress of the United States is imperative: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the 22d Legislature of the State of New Mexico (the Governor concurring herein), That the 84th Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby memorialized to and requested to give the utmost consideration to, and favorable action on, legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project, including construction of the Echo Park Dam; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, United States Senator Dennis Chavez, United States Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Representative John J. Dempsey, Representative Antonio Fernandez, to the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, to the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission, and to the Governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming.*

"DONALD D. HALLAM,

*"Speaker, House of Representatives.*

"FLOYD CROSS,

*"Chief Clerk.*

"Approved by me this 7th day of March 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,

*"Governor, State of New Mexico."*

#### DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT— RESOLUTION OF MADISON (WIS.) GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a letter which I have received from B. D. Leith, secretary of the Madison Geological Society, who expresses the judgment of that organization on behalf of more and better national parks and recreational areas, rather than interference with existing national monuments and regions.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Leith's important message be printed in the RECORD at this point and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY,  
Madison, Wis., March 18, 1955.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Madison Geological Society of Madison, Wis., herewith wishes to enter a plea in favor of more and better parks and recreational spots in these United States. In this connection we wish to express ourselves on the Dinosaur National Monument in the Utah-Colorado area.

In reviewing the literature on the subject, we note that a site for a unique national park is being endangered by plans for an

unnecessary dam and reservoir. Competent engineers state that satisfactory alternate reservoir sites are available; that there is no cause for haste in deciding on a location; and this area is such an excellent one for a national park that it would be a grave error to forever spoil the canyon which is its outstanding feature.

Here in Wisconsin we support any move for more national-park sites in the interest of much-needed facilities for public recreation.

B. D. LEITH,  
Secretary.

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. 1413. A bill to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (Rept. No. 120).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 72. Resolution authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services (Rept. No. 121).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document the pamphlet, *Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?*

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Riley J. Sipe, and sundry other officers, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. STENNIS from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Silas Beach Hays, Medical Corps, United States Army, for appointment as The Surgeon General, United States Army;

Lt. Gen. Lyman Louis Lemnitzer, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Army Forces Far East and Eighth Army, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Research, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Capt. Amos A. Jordan, Jr., for appointment as professor of social science, United States Military Academy;

John J. Powell, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Robert Wesley Tindall, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:  
S. 1542. A bill to authorize an allowance for civilian officers and employees of the

Government who are notaries public; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1543. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to strengthen national defense and to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 1544. A bill for the relief of Maria Guadalupe Schockley and her minor daughter, Evangeline Vega Schockley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 1545. A bill for the relief of Henry Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 1546. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1547. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel;

S. 1548. A bill to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade; and

S. 1549. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to authorize the imposition of administrative fines by the Federal Communications Commission for violations of its rules and regulations, and to authorize the remission or mitigation of such fines by the Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1550. A bill authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Dominion of Canada; and

S. 1551. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Short Sands section of York Beach, York County, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of electors of President and Vice President in the several States, for the election of President and Vice President by such electors, and, in certain cases, for the election of President and Vice President by the joint membership of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO THE IMPOSITION OF FINES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Federal Communications Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to authorize the imposition of administrative fines by the Federal Communica-

tions Commission for violations of its rules and regulations, and to authorize the remission or mitigation of such fines by the Commission. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at this point, a letter from the Federal Communications Commission explaining the purpose of the amendments it is proposing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1549) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to authorize the imposition of administrative fines by the Federal Communications Commission for violations of its rules and regulations, and to authorize the remission or mitigation of such fines by the Commission, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, is as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1955.  
THE VICE PRESIDENT,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission wishes to recommend at this time for the consideration of the Senate the enactment of legislation amending the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide a small civil penalty for violation of the rules and regulations of the Commission applicable to all radio stations other than those in the broadcast services, and to further provide for remission or mitigation thereof by the Commission. This same request has been submitted by the Commission to previous Congresses, but the provision has not been enacted into law. However, the problems which originally prompted the Commission to request this authority have assumed such proportions and such seriousness that the Commission believes that the enactment of this proposal is absolutely essential in order to insure the continued orderly functioning of the nonbroadcast radio services, particularly those which have a direct impact on the protection of life and property.

There has been a rapid and phenomenal expansion in the nonbroadcast radio services since World War II, due largely to the development of new equipment and utilization of new portions of the frequency spectrum. Many small companies have been licensed to operate radio stations as specialized common carriers, particularly in the mobile common carrier services established in 1946. An even greater expansion has taken place in what are known as the safety and special radio services where radio is employed for numerous diverse purposes by large groups of users such as the maritime and aviation interests, police and fire departments, electric and gas companies, forestry agencies, taxicab companies, highway truck and bus companies, etc. As of January 1, 1954, the number of radio stations in the safety and special radio services alone, exclusive of amateur and disaster communications stations, has risen to 145,975, an increase of over 100,000 stations since 1947.

One result of the extensive increase in licensed stations in recent years has been a marked increase in the number of violations of the Commission's technical rules and regulations. This is particularly true in some of the newer private services where radio is not the principal activity of the licensee but is utilized as an adjunct to his primary business activities, and the station operators are

accordingly less concerned with the necessity for adhering to the technical rules governing the use of radio. Most of the offenses are, taken individually, of a comparatively minor nature. Collectively, however, because of their number and variety they represent a very real menace to the orderly use of the radio spectrum and to efficient and effective regulation by the Commission. In addition, these violations result in a serious menace to life and property in those services, such as maritime and aviation, where radio serves as a vital and necessary safety device. Thus, a special survey conducted for a limited period during 1950 revealed that 75 percent of the ship radio stations inspected aboard small vessels failed to comply with one or more of the rules governing the ship service.

The seriousness and magnitude of the problems presented can best be illustrated by the situation that now prevails with respect to small boats equipped for radiotelephone communications and operating in the 2-3-megacycle band. Over the past few years there has been an increase of approximately 400 percent in the number of such small boats equipped for radiotelephone communications. This increase has, in turn, increased the problems of enforcing the Commission's rules.

With respect to the small boats, one of the focal points of the Commission's difficulties is the fishing fleets operating of the coasts of the gulf States and in Mexican territorial waters. In this area the Commission has been plagued by a constantly increasing number of violations of its rules, involving transmissions on unauthorized frequencies, malicious jamming of channels, and the transmission of profane language. For example, in April 1954 two Commission field engineers conducted monitoring operations for 12 days while aboard a fishing boat off the Mexican coast. During that period they observed a total of 291 violations of the Commission's rules.

Most serious of the violations occurring in the gulf area is the widespread misuse of the frequency 2182 kilocycles, which has been designated by international treaty to be a distress frequency. It is essential, of course, that a distress frequency be kept clear of all routine communications. However, in the gulf area the frequency 2182 has been misused for nonessential communications to such a degree that it has been rendered practically useless for safety purposes. Instances have occurred when ships and the Coast Guard have been unable to receive emergency distress calls on 2182 kilocycles because of the volume of illegal transmissions on the channel.

The Commission believes that this situation presents a definite menace to the safety of life and property, and one which is steadily growing worse. Moreover, situations of a similarly serious nature are occurring in other parts of the safety and special radio service, such as the aeronautical service. Unfortunately, however, the Commission does not presently have available any adequate sanction for dealing effectively with this mass of rule violations in the nonbroadcast services. The Commission is authorized to revoke the licenses of stations willfully or repeatedly violating the rules, but even where the seriousness of a particular offense or the substantial number of separate offenses might otherwise warrant resort to this extreme sanction, it will often be particularly inappropriate in the nonbroadcasting services where, as in the case of a ship or plane station, the effect of the revocation would be to deprive the licensee of essential safety equipment or, in the case of a common carrier, to deprive the community of much needed communications service. Similarly, the Commission is authorized to refer aggravated cases of willful or knowing violations of its rules to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution as a misdemeanor.

But, especially since most of the minor violations result from negligence and disinterest rather than willful disregard for the Commission's rules, resort to the criminal sanction can only hope to be of limited value in the Commission's overall enforcement program.

During the 82d Congress, there was enacted a series of amendments to the Communications Act of 1934, including a provision, incorporated in the act as section 312 (b), authorizing the Commission to issue cease and desist orders directed against any person violating the act or the Commission's rules and regulations. And the grant of this additional authority to the Commission was advanced by the conferees on this bill as the reason for their elimination of a provision, applicable to all radio services, permitting the imposition of forfeitures of up to \$500 for violation of the act or the Commission's rules which had been included in the House version of the bill. But while the new cease and desist authority has proven of real value in certain areas of the Commission's enforcement program our experience indicates that the cease and desist procedure is ill-adapted to dealing with the great increase in minor technical violations of the Commission's rules in the common carrier and safety and special radio services.

Our records indicate that violations on the part of a particular operator may be many and varied and may occur over a considerable period of time. Generally, these violations are clearly established and present no dispute as to the facts or law. The cease and desist procedure, which is most useful when directed to a single or continuing situation or practice concerning which there may be disagreement as to facts or interpretation of rule or statute, would appear to be ill-adapted as a means of discouraging such clear-cut violations. Moreover, a cease and desist order is directed only at a particular violation, and, while possibly effective in causing the particular operator to strive to avoid repetition of that particular violation, would not, it is believed, be of any lasting value in stimulating the operator to live up to the Commission's rules in all aspects of his operations. On the other hand, it is thought that knowledge on the part of the licensee that any violation could lead to the prompt imposition of a money penalty, even though it be a small one, would be quite effective in creating an attitude of responsibility for compliance with all regulations.

The cease and desist procedure is also believed to be too cumbersome and time-consuming for the quick and efficient enforcement procedures desired in dealing with the multitudinous violations occurring in the non-broadcast services. Even where the offense is clearly willful, or involves questions of "public health, interest, or safety," so as to make unnecessary the requirement of section 312 (d) of the act of first calling the offense to the attention of the licensee and affording him an opportunity to comply with the particular provision of law which has been violated, a show cause order must first be issued affording the licensee involved a period of at least 30 days from the time of receipt in which to reply and, if desired, request a hearing. Furthermore, the ultimate penalties which must be relied on to make the cease and desist orders effective remain either license revocation or criminal prosecution, which, as has been pointed out, are usually inappropriate for the types of violation by radio licensees found in the common carrier and safety and special radio services.

A study has been conducted of enforcement methods utilized by the Coast Guard and Civil Aeronautics Administration, both of which have regulatory jurisdiction over large groups of persons involving the "traffic law" type of violations which are so common in the nonbroadcast services administered by this Commission. Both the Coast Guard and the CAA are authorized

to impose, administratively, a civil penalty with further authority to remit, mitigate, or compromise the amount of such penalty. If payment is not made, the matter is referred to the Attorney General for collection in a noncriminal proceeding. Both agencies have had considerable success for many years in employing this method to secure compliance with their respective regulations. Information obtained from these agencies indicates that comparatively small individual average amounts of civil penalties are assessed, and that in only a small number of instances has it been found necessary to call upon the Attorney General for collection.

It is the opinion of the Commission that similar enforcement procedure shall be made available for use in the nonbroadcast services. A like procedure now exists under title III, part II of the Communications Act with respect to the larger oceangoing vessels subject to those provisions. This procedure has proven to be most successful with respect to enforcing the provisions of the Commission's rules applicable to such vessels. Extension of such a procedure to all nonbroadcast licensees would, it is believed, aid greatly in the task of regulating the many thousands of such licensees.

While the provisions applicable to vessels provide for a forfeiture of \$500 for each day during which a vessel is navigated in violation of law, the Commission believes that the sum of \$100—noncumulative—for any violation of the Commission's rules in the common carrier and safety and special services field would be sufficient to accomplish the purpose for which it is intended. The mitigation and collection provisions applicable under title III, part II, of the Communications Act would, however, be equally applicable to the new forfeitures. Upon discovery of a violation, the licensee would be notified of the forfeiture incurred because of such violation and of his rights to apply to the Commission for remission or mitigation or to refuse to pay and be brought into court for a judicial determination of his liability. Any forfeitures collected by the Commission would be payable into the Treasury of the United States as provided by section 504 (a) of the Communications Act. It is believed that the ability of the Commission to mitigate the forfeiture would, in these cases as it does in the ship cases, encourage payment without the necessity of the Attorney General bringing a judicial proceeding for recovery.

It is, therefore, recommended that the Communications Act be amended as follows:

1. Under title V change subtitle "Forfeiture in Cases of Rebates and Offsets" to read "Forfeiture in Cases of Rebates and Offsets and Violations of Rules and Regulations."

2. Redesignate section 503 as section 503 (a) and insert a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Any person who violates any rule or regulation made by the Commission under this act to govern any radio station, except licensed radio stations in the broadcast services, and the licensee of any such radio station at which such violation occurs, shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, each forfeit to the United States the sum of \$100."

3. Amend section 504 (b) by revising the phrase in the first sentence thereof "The forfeitures imposed by part II of title III and section 507 of this act" to include a reference to section 503 (b) so that it would read as follows:

"The forfeitures imposed by part II of title III, section 503 (b), and section 507 of this act shall be subject to remission or mitigation by the Commission, upon application therefor, under such regulations and methods of ascertaining the facts as may

seem to it advisable; and, if suit has been instituted, the Attorney General, upon request of the Commission, shall direct the discontinuance of any prosecution to recover such forfeitures: *Provided, however*, That no forfeiture shall be remitted or mitigated after determination by a court of competent jurisdiction."

The Commission considers the enactment of this legislation to be of the utmost importance for the proper enforcement of the Commission's rules and regulations, and to insure that radio can continue to serve effectively as a vital means of protecting life and property. It is, therefore, hoped that this proposal will receive early and favorable consideration by the Senate. The Commission will be glad to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by any committee to which this proposal is referred. The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Commission that it has no objection to the submission of this letter.

GEORGE C. MCCONNAUGHEY,  
Chairman  
(By direction of the Commission).

#### PROPOSED CHANGES IN METHOD OF ELECTING THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has been holding hearings on proposals for changing the method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. The next of these scheduled hearings is, I understand, to be held on tomorrow, March 25, 1955.

In the 82d Congress, I was a cosponsor of the so-called Lodge resolution on this subject. That measure was agreed to by the Senate. In the last Congress, after extensive consultation with the Princeton department of politics and with Mr. Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., an expert in this field, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 100, which would retain the electoral college, but would provide for the election of electors by districts, except for two in each State, who, like Senators, would be elected at large. In the event of the failure of any candidate to receive the vote of at least 40 percent of the whole number of electors, provision is made for election by the Congress, sitting in joint session, and voting by heads rather than by States.

I, personally, am convinced that the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 100, 83d Congress, are more desirable than those of any of the other pending measures on the subject. I, therefore, introduce a joint resolution identical with the former Senate Joint Resolution 100, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of electors of President and Vice President in the several States, for the election of President and Vice President by such electors, and, in certain cases, for the election of President

and Vice President by the joint membership of the Senate and House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce the joint resolution, not out of a sense of competition, but to the end that the Judiciary Committee may have before it as many reasonable ideas as possible. Indeed, it is my understanding that Mr. Wilmerding testified before the subcommittee last week and made extensive reference to the proposals contained in the joint resolution I am now reintroducing.

When I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 100 in the last Congress, the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, at my request, prepared a very useful memorandum on the provisions of the joint resolution and on the problem in general. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ANALYSIS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Section 1 provides that for the purposes of choosing the President and Vice President each State shall be divided into such number of districts as the State has Representatives in Congress. The State legislature in each case is to make the division, but districts must be composed of contiguous and compact territory, and contain as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants. Once districts are established they may not be altered until another census has been taken. It is to be assumed, of course, that reference here is to the decennial Federal census, although the States did at one time, and a few still do, conduct a census.

The language used in section 1 to define the districts to be created by the State legislatures from which electors are to be chosen is the same language used by Congress in describing congressional districts in the reapportionment acts under the 12th (1900) and 13th censuses, the words "and compact" being added under the latter apportionment. (Jan. 16, 1901, secs. 3, 4, ch. 93, 31 Stat. 733, 734; and Aug. 8, 1911, secs. 3, 4, ch. 5, 37 Stat. 13, 14.) Although there is no such requirement in the existing apportionment act (2 U. S. C. 2a-2b), two States have provisions in their constitutions making it mandatory that congressional districts be of contiguous and compact territory. (Virginia constitution (1902) sec. 55 and West Virginia constitution (1872) art. I, sec. 4.)

The idea of division of the States into districts for the purpose of selecting presidential electors is not novel. Following adoption of the Constitution, and beginning in 1788, several of the States voluntarily adopted the district method of electing presidential electors. The method, however, was generally abandoned by the States following the election of 1832. It was taken up again by Michigan in 1892 (laws 1891, No. 50) and is presently used in only one State. This State, Louisiana, requires that presidential electors be chosen from districts, that is, 1 from each congressional district and 2 at large (La. Rev. Stat. (1950) title 18, secs. 1381-1382). The law of this State goes even further and requires that the elector chosen from a district must be a qualified voter in the particular district from which chosen:

"Every qualified voter in the State shall vote for presidential electors as follows: 2 persons shall be selected from the State

at large, and 1 person shall be chosen from each congressional district in the State" (sec. 1381).

"No person is a qualified presidential elector who is not a qualified voter in the district for which he is chosen, or if selected for the State at large, then of some parish of the State" (sec. 1382).

The legislative history of various attempts to get legislation through Congress requiring that electors be chosen by districts are discussed in *McPherson v. Blacker* ((1892) 146 U. S. 1). For discussion of reasons for discontinuance of the district system, see Message of Governor Rich to the Michigan Legislature on January 5, 1893, asking for repeal of the Miner law. The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections in 1874 was of the opinion Congress had no such authority, indicating a constitutional amendment in the nature of the one submitted by you would be necessary to effect the desired result (S. Rept. No. 395, 43d Cong., 1st sess.).

Section 2 of the amendment submitted provides that the inhabitants of each district created pursuant to section 1 shall be entitled to appoint one elector of President and Vice President. Two additional electors shall be appointed from the State at large by the inhabitants of the State. Section 2 would, of course, nullify that portion of clause 2 of section 1 of article II of the Constitution now permitting a State to appoint its electors "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct."

Section 2 adopts the language now used in the Constitution in connection with election of Senators (amendment XVII) and Representatives (art. I, sec. 2, clause 3) in Congress by stating that persons voting for presidential electors "shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures." Such qualifications, therefore, that a State imposed on persons for voting for State officers, that is, for members of the State's legislature (most numerous branch) would also apply to persons voting for presidential electors as such qualifications now apply to those voting for Senators and Representatives in Congress. Section 2 does impose the additional qualification of being from the particular district, in voting for the district elector, but there is no requirement set forth in the section that the elector so chosen must be an inhabitant or resident of the particular district from which he is chosen.

The word "appoint" used in section 2 in connection with choosing of electors would not necessarily mean "elect," although it would permit election. The inhabitants of a district, or of the State as the case may be, could choose some method other than an election to choose the presidential electors. For instance, the provision of the Constitution (art. II, sec. 1, clause 2), now allowing a State to appoint its electors "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct" has been construed by the United States Supreme Court as "leaving it to the State legislatures to appoint directly by joint ballot or concurrent separate action, or through popular election by districts or by general ticket, or as otherwise might be directed." *McPherson v. Blacker* ((1892) 146 U. S. 1, 28) declaring valid the so-called Miner law of Michigan (laws 1891, No. 50) providing for the election of presidential electors by districts in a manner proposed by the amendment submitted.

Sections 1 and 2 of the amendment submitted would not change the number of electors to which each State is presently entitled pursuant to clause 2 of section 1 of article II, that is, one for each Senator and Representative in Congress. Also the provision in section 2 of the amendment submitted that "No Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit

under the United States, shall be appointed an elector" is identical with language presently appearing in clause 2.

Section 3 relates to the meeting of the electors in their respective States, the casting of their ballots for President and Vice President, and the transmittal of the report of the vote of the presidential electors (the electoral college) to the seat of government of the United States. Section 3 is in identical language to that presently employed in the 12th amendment except for a minor grammatical change.

Section 4 relates to the counting of the electoral votes. Presently under the 12th amendment the person having the greatest number of votes for President, if a majority, is elected President, but if no person has such majority, the House of Representatives chooses the President by ballot from the three highest. Similarly the 12th amendment provides that the person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President, if a majority, is elected Vice President, but if no person has a majority, the Senate chooses the Vice President from the two highest. Instead of a majority of the votes cast, section 4 of the amendment submitted, however, would permit a person having the greatest number of votes, providing it be at least 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes, to be elected President or Vice President as the case may be.

Section 4 would also provide for two contingencies. One, if on either the list of persons voted for as President or on the list of persons voted for as Vice President, there are two candidates having the required percentage but are tied for electoral votes, then the Senate and House of Representatives in joint meeting would immediately by ballot choose one of them for President or Vice President, as the case may be. Second, if on either list no person shall have received the required 40 percent; then from the three highest on the list the Senate and House would in like manner choose the President and Vice President.

Under section 4 of the amendment submitted, when the choice devolves upon the Congress to select either a President or Vice President, the votes shall be taken by heads and not by States, and a majority of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and House shall be necessary to a choice. Since there are 435 Representatives and 96 Senators, or a combined total of 531, this majority would be at least 266. This is actually a majority of the whole number of electors appointed and is the same majority numerically now required to elect under the present system. Presently, under the 12th amendment, when no candidate for President has received a majority of the vote of the whole number of electors, the House of Representatives ballots for President, their choice being confined to the persons not exceeding three who have received the highest electoral vote. The votes in the House are taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote. A quorum of the House for this purpose consists of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. The vote of at least 25 of the States is now required in case of such a contingency to elect the President. The vote of the delegation of each State is taken separately, and the person receiving a majority of the votes given by the Representatives from the State receives the vote of that State. If the vote of the delegation is divided, the vote of the State does not count. (For election of President by the House, see *Annals*, 7th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 1010, 1022-1028 (1801); and after the 12th amendment, see *Congressional Debates*, vol. 1, 18th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 361-363, 515.) This method of choosing the President and Vice President by the House and Senate, would in effect be

substituting Members of the House and Senate for the electoral college since numerically each group combined contains 531 Members. Such a method, eliminating voting by State and substituting a per capita vote, would eliminate the advantage now enjoyed by the smaller States when an election is thrown into the House.

Section 5 of the amendment submitted is entirely new and reads as follows:

"Sec. 5. The legislature of each State may specify the places of holding elections for electors, prescribe the manner of voting, and provide for the appointment of proper persons to conduct such elections with authority to declare definitely the result thereof, but the Congress may by law make or alter such regulations. If the legislature of any State fails to divide the State into districts as provided in this article, the Congress may lay off such State into districts for the election of electors."

This section applied to presidential electors is similar to present article I, section 4, clause 1, when applied to election of Senators and Representatives, but is more far reaching. The proposed section 5 would allow the States to specify the places of holding the elections for electors and prescribe the manner of voting. The States would also appoint the officials to conduct the elections and have authority to declare who was elected. However, the power would be reserved to the Congress to make or alter any such regulations made by the States. Although the proposed article of amendment does not declare that presidential electors are Federal officers, the fact that their appointment or election is rather extensively regulated would indicate that they are to be considered Federal officers. See *In re Green* ((1890), 134 U. S. 277), holding that presently electors are not Federal officers.

In addition, section 5, specifically stating that Congress has the power to divide a State into districts for election of electors upon failure of a State to so act, seems to be a mere restatement of a power Congress would automatically have upon adoption of the rest of the amendment. By way of analogy, Congress presently has the power to require that the States elect Representatives from districts (and it has at times exercised this power) or the Congress may actually do the dividing itself. This power is derived from section 4 of article 1 of the Constitution authorizing it to regulate the places and manner of holding elections for Representatives. Under clause 18, section 8, article 1, Congress has the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing power. See 42 *Harvard Law Review* 1017, note 4, and *Colegrove v. Green* ((1945), 328 U. S. 549, 555).

The amendment submitted does not alter the present constitutional and statutory provisions relating to the time of choosing electors found in article II, section 1, clause 4, and 48 Statutes 879, codified 62 Statutes 672 as United States Code, section 1.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. McNAMARA:

Statement prepared by him on the 134th anniversary of Greek independence.

By Mr. BIBLE:

Article entitled "More Shipbuilding on West Coast Is Predicted by Senate Leader," published in the New York Times of March 23, 1955, and having reference to an address delivered by Senator Magnuson before the Western States Council at San Francisco, Calif.

# NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today the following nominations: Joseph E. Jacobs, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career Minister, to be Ambassador of the United States to Poland, John M. Allison, of Nebraska, Ambassador to Japan, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the Representative of the United States to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador of the United States to Burma, vice William J. Sebald, resigned. I desire to give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

## THE LATE WALTER WHITE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, at this very moment, funeral services are being held in New York for a very great American, Mr. Walter White, who died last Monday.

I had the honor of Walter White's friendship for more than 30 years, during all of which I was associated with him as a director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Walter White was an unusually courageous and farsighted leader who helped mold a small group of people—the founders and early members of the NAACP—into an influential, effective and highly respected organization. He was a great and unflinching fighter for freedom and justice. It is noteworthy that his efforts were directed to securing and maintaining civil rights and liberties, justice, and equality for not only the people of his own race, but for all the people of our country and, in fact, for all the people of the world. He was utterly selfless in his devotion, and gave of himself without stint or fear to the causes he served so long and so well. I mourn his passing as a close and dear friend and as a well-nigh irretrievable loss to the cause of freedom and equality to which he had devoted his life.

Mr. President, there have appeared yesterday and today in many of the newspapers, editorials eulogizing Walter White. These editorials, moving as they are, inevitably inadequately describe the qualities of heart and mind of this great man. His deeds and his principles speak for themselves, and will long be remembered. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, editorials which appeared in the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Post, and the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 23, 1955]

### WALTER WHITE

Walter White was the adviser of statesmen and soldiers, in peace and war. His work for the Negro was enormously effective over more than three decades. That he was the author of President Roosevelt's Executive order on fair employment practices in war industries is but one evidence out of many of the weight of his counsel and his vision. In his post of executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People he was at the center of the conflict between bigotry and democracy which the so-called race question involves. Considerable progress has been made, in recent times here, in resolving this conflict. A great deal of what has been achieved can be directly traced to his influence.

Blue-eyed and fair of color, Walter White did not need to identify himself as a Negro. He did so deliberately and in its way this act made a special mockery of race discrimination.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 23, 1955]

### WALTER WHITE

Walter White was one of the most important leaders in one of the most important struggles of his day. As executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, he was regarded as a leader and spokesman for the American Negro, a man who had long ago earned the affection of his own people and the respect of others.

In his long service to the Negro, Mr. White had seen the virtual elimination of lynching, the enactment of fair employment laws, the reduction of discrimination, the outlawing of segregation in the Armed Forces, the approach, heralded by the Supreme Court decision, of racial integration in the Nation's schools. For all these objectives he had labored zealously and devotedly; he crusaded not by inflaming passions or by preaching violence, but by putting his faith in democratic ways and the conscience of his fellow citizens. And he lived to see his faith and hope justified.

Walter White might have led a different life, apart from racial strife. He was but one-sixty-fourth Negro and could have, if he had chosen, remained a white man to the world. But his people needed him and perhaps he, too, needed them. With their help and the help of other friends, he accomplished much. If, when he died, much still remained to do, none knew better than Walter White that freedom is a never-ending job.

[From the New York Post of March 23, 1955]

### THE BURDEN OF WALTER WHITE

The perpetual irony in the story of Walter White, who served so long and well as executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was that his complexion was white. This accident of life dramatized better than any phrase the irrationality of racial prejudice. He could have been spared the casual rebuffs and systematic cruelties inflicted on Negroes; yet he felt a profound impulse to proclaim his racial identity.

What fascinated him was the way social attitudes could be altered by his simple announcement to almost any company of strangers that White was black. After all he was still the same man who had been greeted with cordiality just a moment before; why was there sudden embarrassment, hostility

and aloofness as soon as he called himself Negro?

Thus he went through life zestfully parodying all the myths of racial supremacy and valiantly battling for a world which would be truly color blind. As long as there were bigots, he preferred to be among the hated rather than the haters; as long as any men were to be judged by their skin, he chose to be among the condemned.

Though he fought a thousand good fights for human equality and simple decency, Walter White remained remarkably devoid of bitterness. In the worst moments he may have been sustained by the cosmic joke which he had been fortuitously enabled to play on the intolerant men whose faces were no whiter than his own.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 24, 1955]

### WALTER WHITE

It was given to Walter White to enter and experience much of the promised land to which he led his people. As a boy in Atlanta, Ga., he knew at first hand the horror of race rioting and the ugliness of a lynch mob. He lived through racial discrimination in housing and schooling and recreation. But before his death the pattern of race relations in the United States had undergone a tremendous transformation. Violence against the Negro had virtually disappeared from the South. And segregation in public facilities had been declared by the courts of the land to be in contravention of the Constitution.

As executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Walter White played a dynamic part in effecting this change. And as a man, Nordic in appearance and predominantly of Caucasian ancestry, who chose freely to identify himself as a Negro, he played a dramatic part in helping his fellow Americans to understand the folly of race prejudice. He gave his life to a heroic cause now well on its way to triumph.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] regarding the late Walter White. A few days ago, when notice of Mr. White's death appeared in the newspapers, I made a brief statement on the floor of the Senate; and at this time I am glad to renew that statement, in behalf of that great American.

## THE POSTAL PAY BILL—NOTICE OF SPEECH

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I understand that when the Senate concludes action on the cotton bill, it will take up the postal pay increase bill. Therefore, I desire to announce that after the chairman of the committee has explained that bill, and after the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], has submitted his substitute, I shall seek recognition, to explain and discuss what will then be before the Senate. I shall deal primarily with the history of the Post Office Department.

The Post Office Department has been in operation now nearly 166 years. While it is a vast establishment, as compared with what Benjamin Franklin had 166 years ago, I think it would be helpful to us, in legislating on postal rates and the pay of postal employees, and as a guide to what we should do, to refresh

our memories regarding what those who started this experiment in socialism, if you please, namely, government control of a monopoly, had in mind, and how they operated it.

I recognize that the burdens of all Members of the Senate have become so onerous in our \$60 billion government that not many Members can remain on the floor to hear the debate, no matter how vital it may be. Therefore, I make this announcement in the hope that before we vote on the postal pay, some Members, at least, will take the time to review in the RECORD what I have to say about the bill, as a guide, perhaps, for our future policy.

I wish to say that I do not propose to make a lengthy speech; and I shall not vary from manuscript, because I shall have no manuscript.

#### SOME TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS BROKEN BY SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in recent days there have been some discussions regarding the possibility of a 4-power meeting by the heads of states, whether such a meeting would be advisable, what preliminary steps should be taken, and what consideration should be given as to whether the Soviet Union should be expected to perform by deeds, rather than by words.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and the country, and lest anyone believes that a mere meeting of the heads of states would solve the problem, I think we should consider what has happened to other agreements the Soviet Union has entered into.

The following treaties and agreements concluded by the U. S. S. R. were broken when Soviet Russia occupied eastern Poland at the beginning of World War II; imposed the Mutual Assistance Pacts upon Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in October 1939; invaded Finland in November 1939; and absorbed the three Baltic States, Bessarabia, and northern Bukovina in 1940:

First. Peace treaties, 1920 to 1921: These peace treaties concluded between Soviet Russia and Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland contained the principle of respecting one another's territorial integrity. In a protocol agreed to at the Warsaw conference of March 1922, the sanctity of the peace treaties was affirmed by Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, and Soviet Russia.

Second. The Litvinov Protocol, February 1929: This protocol was a declaration of adherence to the Treaty of Paris, or the Kellogg-Briand Pact, outlawing war as an instrument of national policy. It was signed by Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. Finland adhered to the Treaty of Paris.

Third. Convention defining an aggressor, July 1933: Article II of the convention laid down various conditions in which aggression would be regarded as occurring. Article III stated that:

No political, military, economic, or other considerations may serve as an excuse or justification for the aggression referred to in article II.

Among the signatories to this Convention were Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Finland, U. S. S. R., and Rumania.

Fourth. Pacts of nonaggression: Among the nations with which the Soviet Union concluded nonaggression pacts were Lithuania, 1926; Finland, 1932; Latvia, 1932; Estonia, 1932; and Poland, 1932.

Fifth. Pacts of mutual assistance, October 1939: These pacts were forcibly imposed upon Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. The imposition of these pacts did in fact violate previous Soviet promises to respect the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of the Baltic States. Moreover, each pact contained a clause reaffirming previous Soviet treaty obligations to the Baltic States. Thus, in addition to all other treaties concluded with the Soviet Union, the Pacts of Mutual Assistance were also broken when the three Baltic states were incorporated into the U. S. S. R. in 1940.

Sixth. Covenant of the League of Nations: When Soviet Russia invaded Finland in November 1940, the League of Nations formally condemned the aggressive action and expelled the Soviet Union from the League.

Among the treaties and agreements concluded with and broken by the Soviet Union since World War II are: Yalta agreement; Potsdam agreement; armistice agreement relating to the function of the Allied Control Commission in Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania; peace treaties with Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania; Cairo declaration, reaffirmed at Potsdam and subscribed to by the Soviet Union; the Soviet-Iranian Treaty of Friendship of 1921; Declaration of Teheran; Potsdam declaration defining terms for Japanese surrender; and the Sino-Soviet treaty and agreements of August 14, 1945. For an analysis of Soviet violations of these treaties and agreements, see United States Congress, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Background Information on the Soviet Union in International Relations, 81st Congress, second session, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1950.

In addition to the above violations of agreements and treaties, there are the instances in which the Soviet Union has broken its pledges made to the United States in the exchange of letters of November 1933, which resulted in recognition, relating to noninterference in American affairs. In 1935, the American Government dispatched a vigorous protest against Soviet violations of this particular pledge of noninterference on the occasion when American Communist leaders gave progress reports of the revolutionary movement in the United States at the Seventh Congress of the Third International which convened in Moscow in July 1935.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain material from House Report No. 3135, 81st Congress, 2d session, entitled "Background Information on the Soviet Union in International Relations." It is a report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 206, and it lists the Soviet violations of treaty obligations. The material begins on page 1 and extends through page 23.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE SOVIET UNION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, August 25, 1950.

(Foreword)

Following is a compilation of material, based on published documents, on the record of the Soviet Union in international relations. This data has been prepared, on my instructions, by Mr. Sheldon Z. Kaplan and Mr. George Lee Millikan, consultants on the staff of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The material assembled herein indicates some of the main currents of Soviet policy, such as treaty violations, obstructionism in the solution of international problems, and territorial expansion.

It is hoped that this compilation will serve as background information on the trends of the Soviet Union in international relations.

JOHN KEE,  
Chairman.

#### I. SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF TREATY OBLIGATIONS

##### A. Germany AGREEMENTS

1. Final delimitation of German-Polish frontier should await the peace settlement (Potsdam protocol, VIII, B, August 2, 1945).

2. Payment of reparations to leave enough resources to enable German people to subsist without external assistance. Reparation claims of U. S. S. R. to be met by removals of capital goods and appropriation of external assets. Economic controls in Germany to be limited to those essential to curb German war potential and insure equitable distribution of essential goods among zones (Potsdam protocol, II, B, 15, 19; III, 1).

3. Germany to be treated as a single economic unit (Potsdam protocol, II, B, 14).

#### I. SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF TREATY OBLIGATIONS

##### A. Germany VIOLATIONS

1. U. S. S. R. has repeatedly maintained that the Oder-Neisse line constitutes the definitive German-Polish frontier and has approved incorporation of territory east of this line into Poland. On July 6, 1950, the Soviet-controlled Governments of Poland and Eastern Germany signed an agreement to this effect.

2. U. S. S. R. has taken large amounts of reparations from current production, has absorbed a substantial part of German industry in Soviet zone into Soviet state-owned concerns, and has otherwise exploited and drained German resources in a manner not authorized by Potsdam protocol or other agreements.

U. S. S. R. has refused to submit detailed report on any reparations removals from its zone.

3. U. S. S. R. has consistently obstructed all attempts to implement this principle. It has followed a unilateral economic policy in its own zone. In particular it has refused to cooperate in establishing a common export-import program for Germany as a whole, and in permitting "equitable distribution of

## AGREEMENTS

4. All democratic political parties to be allowed and encouraged throughout Germany (Potsdam protocol, II, A, 9).

5. Control Council agreed to prevent German political leaders or the press from making statements criticizing allied decisions or aimed at disrupting allied unity or creating hostile German attitude toward any occupying powers (Control Council Directive No. 40, October 12, 1946).

6. Allied Control Authority authorized free exchange of printed matter and films in the different zones and Berlin (Control Council Directive No. 55, June 25, 1947).

7. Freedom of speech and press are guaranteed (Potsdam protocol, II, A, 10). Germany is to be prepared for eventual reconstruction of political life on democratic basis (Potsdam protocol, II, A, 3).

8. German external assets in Finland, eastern Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, to be vested in the German External Property Commission (Control Council Law No. 5, October 30, 1945).

9. Quadripartite legislation has been enacted to provide tax uniformity and stabilization of wages in all zones (Control Council Laws Nos. 12, February 11, 1946, and 61, December 19, 1947; Control Council Directive No. 14, October 12, 1945).

10. All German prisoners of war to be repatriated by December 31, 1948 (Council of Foreign Ministers, Moscow, March 10-April 24, 1947).

11. By Four-Power agreement supreme authority was to be exercised by an Allied Control Council, consisting of the four commanders in chief (statement on control machinery, June 5, 1945).

12. By Four-Power agreement administration of Berlin was to be conducted by a four-power Kommandatura, consisting of the city's four commandants (statement on control machinery).

13. Each occupying power shall insure the normal functioning of transport between Berlin and the zones as well as between the Soviet and western zones (par. 5, Paris CFM communique, June 20, 1949).

14. On repeated occasions during and after the war, U. S. S. R. agreed that demilitarization of Germany should be one of the cardinal aims of the occupation. (Crimea Conference, February 11, 1945; Berlin, June 5, 1945; Potsdam protocol, Four Power agreement on additional requirements to be imposed on Germany, September 20, 1945; Con-

## VIOLATIONS

essential commodities between the several zones so as to produce a balanced economy through Germany and reduce the need for imports."

4. Soviet authorities have restricted freedom of action of non-Communist parties by depriving them of facilities equal with the Communist-dominated Socialist Unity Party (SED); by interfering in their internal affairs, coercing their leaders, and dictating party actions; and in general by denying them the autonomy essential to democratic political organizations. The Social Democratic Party has been denied the right to operate in the Soviet zone as an independent organization.

5. Soviet authorities have permitted and encouraged scurrilous propagandistic campaigns by the Soviet zone press and political leaders directed against the western powers, and particularly the United States.

6. Soviet authorities have repeatedly barred from the Soviet zone or Soviet sector of Berlin such materials originating in other zones.

7. Soviet authorities have nullified any genuine freedom of speech and press through a system of suppression, intimidation and terrorism by military, police, and party authorities. A totalitarian police system is being built up which suppresses basic human rights and legal processes and indulges in arbitrary seizures of property, arrests, detentions, deportation, forced labor, and other practices contrary to democratic principles.

8. U. S. S. R. has directly appropriated German external assets in these countries without unvesting and assignment by the German External Property Commission as required by Control Council Law No. 5.

9. Soviet authorities have permitted the land governments of Brandenburg and Saxony-Anhalt to grant partial tax exemptions to large groups of wage and salary earners in violation of this legislation. This move is intended to stop the exodus of skilled workers to the western zones, to encourage qualified workers to take jobs in Soviet-owned factories, and to make propaganda for improving the living standards of Soviet-zone workers.

10. U. S. S. R. did not return all German prisoners of war by this date but announced a new deadline—January 1, 1950. On May 4, 1950, U. S. S. R. declared in a Tass announcement that all German PW's had been repatriated—although large numbers still remain in the U. S. S. R.

11. On March 20, 1948, the Soviet commander unilaterally adjourned a meeting of the council and abruptly walked out, thereby precipitating a rupture of its operations.

12. On June 16, 1948, the Soviet representative walked out of a meeting of the Kommandatura. On July 1, 1948, Soviet authorities announced that they would no longer participate in any meetings. These acts finally destroyed the quadripartite control machinery of Berlin. The Berlin blockade, which became total on July 2, 1948, and was not lifted until May 12, 1949, was a further effort to destroy the quadripartite status of the city.

13. Since January 13, 1950, the Soviet authorities have intermittently interfered with traffic between Berlin and West Germany.

14. U. S. S. R. has created in Eastern Germany a police force of approximately 50,000. Because of its training and equipment, this force is actually military in character.

## AGREEMENTS

Control Council Law No. 34, Dissolution of the Wehrmacht, August 20, 1946, etc.)

## B. Austria

1. Obligation of Allied Council (United States, United Kingdom, France and U. S. S. R., the occupying powers) to insure the removal of all restrictions on movement within Austria of persons, goods, or other traffic; economic unity to be promoted (new control agreement of June 28, 1946, art. 4, a).

2. Obligation to open the way for the Austrian people to find economic security (Moscow declaration, November 1, 1943). Obligation of Allied Council to assist Austrian Government to recreate a sound national life based on stable economic and financial conditions; to assist Austrian Government to assume full control of affairs of state in Austria; to facilitate full exercise of Austrian Government's authority equally in all zones; to promote the economic unity of Austria (new control agreement, arts. 3, c; 3, d; and 4, a).

4. Obligations with respect to stable economic and financial conditions, free movement within Austria as a whole, and economic unity (new control agreement, arts. 3, c; 4, a).

5. Obligation to assist Austrian Government to recreate a sound and democratic national life based on respect for law and order (new control agreement, art. 3, c).

6. Obligations with respect to law and order, assumption by Austrian Government of full control of affairs of state, full exercise of Austrian Government's authority equally in all zones (new control agreement, arts. 3, c; 3, d; and 4, a).

7. Obligation with respect to full exercise of Austrian Government's authority equally in all zones (new control agreement, art. 4, a).

## C. Eastern and southeastern Poland

## 1. Poland

"This Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these selections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates" (Crimean Conference, February 11, 1945).

"The three powers note that the Polish Provisional Government in accordance with the decisions of the Crimea Conference has agreed to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates \* \* \* ." (Potsdam agreement, Aug. 2, 1945).

## 2. Hungary

1. Under the armistice agreement an Allied Control Commission was established under the chairmanship of the U. S. S. R. and with participation of the United States and United Kingdom (armistice agreement, January 1945, art. 18 and annex F).

2. The 3 heads of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, and United Kingdom declared their mutual agreement "to concert during

## VIOLATIONS

*B. Austria*

1. Soviet-instituted system of licensing specified categories of goods for shipment from eastern to other zones (December 1947) impedes free movement of goods and traffic throughout Austria as a whole.

2. Properties seized by the Soviets such as oil, land, and industrial plants are in excess of what might reasonably be construed as legitimate German assets under the Potsdam protocol. Removals of equipment and materials have been made under the guise of German assets and war booty. Soviet authorities are engaging in economic practices having a deleterious effect on the Austrian economy and which are outside the application of Austrian law.

4. Soviet authorities designate certain rolling stock as "war booty," prohibit its movement from Soviet to other zones, and propose that Austrians "repurchase" this equipment.

5. Soviets interfere with Austrian efforts to maintain law and order through arbitrary arrest or abduction of Austrians.

6. Soviet authorities in the eastern zone and in the Soviet sector of Vienna have confiscated Austrian publications and threatened the distributors of publications.

7. Soviet authorities have sought to intimidate the Austrian authorities by issuing prohibitions against the holding of local elections.

*C. Eastern and southeastern Europe*

## 1. Poland

On several occasions prior to the elections and following persistent reports of reprehensible methods employed by the government against the democratic opposition, the United States and Great Britain reminded the Polish Provisional Government of its obligations. On January 5, 1947, the British and Soviet Governments were asked to join the United States in approaching the Poles on this subject. The British Government made similar representations to the Soviet Government for Soviet support in calling for a strict fulfillment of Poland's obligations. The Soviet Government refused to participate. The British and American representations were summarily rejected by the Polish Government as "unde interference" in the internal affairs of Poland.

Of the 444 deputies elected to the Parliament in the elections of January 19, 1947, the Polish Peasant Party (reported to represent a large majority of the population) obtained only 28 places, thus demonstrating the efficiency with which the government had prepared the ground. On January 28, the Department of State issued a press release stating that reports received from our Embassy in Poland immediately before and after the elections, based upon the observations of American officials, confirmed the fears this Government had expressed that the election would not be free.

## 2. Hungary

1. The Soviet representative on the ACC for Hungary consistently acted unilaterally in the name of the ACC without consultation or notice to his American and British colleagues, thus denying them any semblance of effective participation in the work of the ACC.

2. Contrary to the agreement, the U. S. S. R., acting through the Hungarian Communist Party and its own agencies and armed forces in Hungary, unilaterally sub-

## AGREEMENTS

the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their 3 Governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems" (Yalta agreement, February 1945).

3. Upon the cessation of hostilities, it was agreed at Potsdam that the United States, United Kingdom, and U. S. S. R. would consult to revise the procedures of the Allied Control Commissions for Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary to provide for effective participation by the United States and United Kingdom in the work of those bodies (Potsdam protocol XI, August 1945).

## 3. Bulgaria

1. The armistice agreement established an Allied Control Commission under Soviet direction during the period of hostilities but with United States and United Kingdom participation (armistice agreement, October 1944, art. XVIII).

2. Bulgaria was obligated to restore United Nations property, to make reparation for war damage as later determined, to restore all

## VIOLATIONS

verted the will of the Hungarian people to totalitarianism in negation of fundamental freedoms. For example:

(a) General Sviridov, Deputy Soviet Chairman of the ACC, without consulting the United States and United Kingdom ACC representatives, dissolved Catholic youth organizations, June 1946.

(b) Soviet armed forces arrested Bela Kovacs, member of Parliament and former secretary general of Smallholders Party, February 1947.

(c) General Sviridov precipitated a political crisis enabling the Communist minority to force the resignation of Prime Minister Nagy, May-June 1947.

(d) The Soviet Government refused repeated United States proposals to join in tripartite examination of Hungary's economic situation to assist Hungary to solve its pressing economic problems, 1946.

(e) Discriminatory economic agreements were forced upon Hungary, including the establishment of joint Soviet-Hungarian companies, 1945-1947.

(f) The Soviet ACC representative contended that only the occupational forces which control the airfields can permit the Hungarian Government to negotiate air agreements. Notwithstanding, Soviet authorities formed a Hungarian-Soviet civil air transport company. The Hungarian Government was also permitted to negotiate agreements with certain other countries but not with the United States or Britain.

3. Despite repeated requests, the U. S. S. R. declined to discuss the revision of procedures for the Control Commissions as agreed at Potsdam. Instead, it continued to act unilaterally in the name of the Commissions in matters of substance without consultation with, or notice to, the United States and United Kingdom members. For example:

(a) Instructions were issued by the Soviet High Command regarding the size of the Hungarian Army without consulting the British or United States representatives.

(b) Without the knowledge of the United States the Soviet deputy chairman of the ACC ordered the Hungarian Government to disband certain Catholic youth organizations in June-July 1946. He also recommended dismissal of certain government officials.

(c) In the fall of 1946 and without consulting the Americans or British, the Soviet element of the ACC gave permission to form the Hungarian Freedom Party.

(d) Early in 1947 the Hungarian police were ordered by the Soviet chairman in the name of the Allied Control Commission to suppress the publication of Count Ciano's diary.

(e) In early 1947 the Soviet chairman stated he had personally given approval to the Hungarian Government to resume diplomatic relations with certain countries in the name of the Allied Control Commission and without prior discussion with the British or Americans.

(f) In May 1947 the ACC chairman refused the United States permission to visit Hungarian Army units.

(g) Soviet authorities refused to permit free movement of the American element of the Allied Control Commission (also applicable to Bulgaria).

(h) The Soviets refused to transmit to the American representative data on the arrest of Bela Kovacs by the Soviet Army.

## 3. Bulgaria

1. The Soviet chairman of the ACC repeatedly took unilateral action in the name of the ACC and without consultation with his United States or United Kingdom colleagues, thus effectively negating United States and United Kingdom participation.

2. The U. S. S. R. has aided and abetted the Bulgarian Government's failure in varying degrees, to fulfill these provisions of the

## AGREEMENTS

United Nations rights and interests, and to make available to Greece and Yugoslavia immediately on reparation account foodstuffs in quantities to be agreed by the United States, United Kingdom, and Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (armistice agreement, October 1944, arts. IX, X, XI, and par. 1 of protocol).

3. The three heads of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, and United Kingdom declared their agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe their policies in assisting the liberated peoples to solve their political and economic problems by democratic means. (Yalta Agreement on Liberated Europe, February 1945).

4. The United Kingdom, United States, and U. S. S. R. stated they had no doubt that representatives of the allied press would enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Bulgaria (Potsdam communiqué X, August 1945).

5. The Potsdam agreement provided that upon the termination of hostilities, consultations should be held to revise the procedures of the Allied Control Commissions for Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary to provide for effective three-power participation in the Commissions (Potsdam protocol XI, August 1945).

6. The U. S. S. R. undertook to give friendly advice to the Bulgarian Government regarding the desirability of including in the Government two representatives of democratic groups, "who (a) are truly representative of the groups of the parties which are not participating in the Government, and (b) are really suitable and will work loyally with the Government" (Moscow Conference, December 1945).

## 4. Rumania

1. The three heads of the governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, and United Kingdom declared "their mutual agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their three governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems." (Yalta agreement on liberated Europe, February 1945.)

## VIOLATIONS

armistice. The Soviets have refused to consider with the United States and United Kingdom Bulgaria's obligation to restore and reconstitute United Nations property and interests. While deliveries of foodstuffs were made to the Yugoslavs unilaterally, the U. S. S. R. has blocked three-power consideration of amounts to be shipped to Greece. None has been shipped to that country.

3. The Soviet Government has consistently refused to agree with the United States and United Kingdom on policies to assist the people of Bulgaria to solve their political and economic problems democratically. On the contrary, the Soviet Government, through the local Communist Party, has unilaterally subverted representative democratic processes in Bulgaria and assisted in denying the Bulgarian people the exercise of fundamental freedoms. For example, in 1945 Soviet authorities unilaterally interfered in the internal affairs of Bulgaria's largest political party by demanding and obtaining the replacement of Dr. G. M. Dimitrov as Secretary General of the Agrarian Union.

4. The Soviet Chairman of the ACC consistently thwarted American press coverage of Bulgarian developments by negative or extremely dilatory action on United States Government requests for entry permits for reputable American correspondents. However, representatives of the Daily Worker and other left-wing periodicals were permitted to enter Bulgaria without difficulties.

5. The Soviet Government refused repeated United States and United Kingdom requests to consult as agreed. It continued to operate the Allied Control Commissions unilaterally without effective participation of or even, on occasion, knowledge of the United States and United Kingdom members.

6. The Soviet authorities, despite the Moscow agreement, sided with and abetted a minority Bulgarian Communist regime in thwarting the implementation of that agreement and prevented the broadening of the Bulgarian Government.

## 4. Rumania

1. Contrary to its agreement the U. S. S. R., acting through the Rumanian Communist Party and its own agencies and armed forces in Rumania, systematically and unilaterally subverted the democratic will of the Rumanian people to totalitarianism in negation of their fundamental freedoms. Major examples are as follows:

(a) By unilateral intervention Soviet occupation authorities and Vishinsky (February-March 1945) effected the overthrow of Premier Radescu's interim representative government and installed a Communist-controlled regime.

(b) Unilateral support of Premier Groza's retention of office in defiance of the king's demand for his resignation and the United States request for tripartite consultation in response to the king's appeal (August 1945).

(c) Direct and indirect unilateral interference by the Soviet occupation authorities in the election campaign of 1946, including the use of Soviet troops to break up meetings of the opposition, and arbitrary exercise of censorship.

(d) Preclusive exploitation of the Rumanian economy, from 1944 onward, through (1) armistice extractions many times in excess of the requirements of the armistice agreement and in large measure unauthorized by that agreement, (2) the establishment of Soviet-controlled joint companies covering the principal economic activities of Rumania, and (3) commercial agreements the knowledge of whose terms was repeatedly refused to the other two Yalta powers.

## AGREEMENTS

2. Agreed at Potsdam that the Allied Control Commission procedure should be revised to provide for effective United States and United Kingdom participation in the work of those bodies (Potsdam protocol XI, revised Allied Control Commission procedure in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary).

3. The three Governments stated that they had no doubt that, in view of the changed conditions resulting from the termination of the war in Europe, representatives of the allied press would enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Rumania.

## 5. The peace treaties

Upon the ratification of the treaties of peace with Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania on September 15, 1947, the armistice period and the authority of the Allied Control Commissions came to an end. On this date the treaties entered into force and the three Governments regained a type of nominal sovereignty. In fact, however, the U. S. S. R. continued to exercise tutelary powers over them. In consequence the implementation of the treaties was characterized by subservient fulfillment of obligations toward the U. S. S. R., but by evasion, delay, and

## (A) Hungary

## Direct responsibility

Under article 40 of the "Treaty of Peace" any dispute over the execution of the treaty, not settled by diplomatic negotiations should be referred to the heads of the United States, United Kingdom, and U. S. S. R. missions in Budapest.

## Indirect responsibility

1. Under article 2 of the peace treaty the Hungarian Government has undertaken to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion, and of public meeting.

## VIOLATIONS

(e) Rejection of a proposal by the United States and United Kingdom in December 1946 to set up a joint commission to study the economic situation in Rumania.

(f) Unilateral intervention, from March 1945 onward, in Rumanian commercial negotiations with countries outside the Soviet orbit.

2. Despite repeated requests, the U. S. S. R. refused to consult on the procedural revision and continued unilaterally throughout the armistice period to operate the ACC in Rumania without effective participation by the United States and United Kingdom. Examples are as follows:

(a) Issuance of directives to Rumanian authorities by Soviet element of ACC without agreement of United States and United Kingdom representatives, sometimes in the face of United States and United Kingdom protests, and often without notification or discussion. Many of these directives were prejudicial to United States interests.

(b) Obstructive handling of clearances to enter Rumania for official United States personnel and aircraft.

3. In contravention of this agreement, the Soviet Chairman of the ACC by the usurpation of authority, delayed and withheld entry permits to Rumania for accredited United States correspondents, ejected several correspondents from that country on fabricated charges, and censored United States press dispatches. These obstructive tactics, which continued throughout the armistice period, were particularly in evidence prior to the Rumanian elections of November 1946.

violations of obligations to the western allies. The Soviet Union condoned and in many cases abetted these infringements and, as the tutelary power, must bear responsibility for them. As a result of this peculiar relationship between the U. S. S. R. and these Governments, it will be necessary to distinguish between treaty violations, for which the U. S. S. R. bears direct responsibility, and other infringements, committed by the Soviet-sponsored governments but for which indirect responsibility must be ascribed to the Soviet Government.

## (A) Hungary

## Direct responsibility

On May 31, 1949, the United States requested the United Kingdom and U. S. S. R. to hold a meeting of the 3 heads of mission in Budapest to settle the dispute over Hungarian noncompliance with article 2 of the treaty—the so-called human-rights clause. The Soviet Union, in its note of June 11, 1949, refused to participate in the meeting. A second United States note, delivered on June 30, 1949, expressed regret for the Soviet Union's disregard for the provisions of the treaty, and asserted that the existence of a dispute between the United States and Hungary could not be questioned. In a memorandum dated July 19, 1949, the Soviet Union reaffirmed its contention that no basis existed for a meeting of the 3 heads of mission. Since that time the Soviet Union has consistently refused to participate in such a meeting.

## Indirect responsibility

1. (a) Freedom of expression, and of press and publication, no longer exist. All non-conformist and oppositionist press organizations have been suppressed or terrorized; editors and publishers have been imprisoned or driven into exile; foreign correspondents have been expelled; hundreds of arrests and convictions have taken place on charges of spreading information prejudicial to the government.

(b) Freedom of worship has been interfered with time and again, either through

## AGREEMENTS

2. Under article 10 of the treaty Hungary undertook to honor its prewar bilateral treaties with the allied and associated powers, provided that the other contracting party, within a period of 6 months from the coming into force of the treaty, notified the Hungarian Government of its desire to keep in force or revive the bilateral treaty in question.

3. Under article 23 of the treaty Hungary undertook to pay \$100 million as reparations to Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

4. Under article 26 of the treaty Hungary undertook to restore all legal rights and interest of the United Nations and their nationals as they existed on September 1, 1939, and to compensate such persons for property loss and war damage.

5. Where a dispute arose between Hungary and another contracting party over interpretation of the execution of the treaty, which was not resolved by the three heads of mission in Budapest, Hungary, undertook in article 40 of the treaty to appoint a delegate to a three-member commission composed of one representative of each party and a third member selected by mutual agreement by nationals of a third party.

## (B) Bulgaria

## Direct responsibility

Under article 36 of the peace treaty with Bulgaria any dispute on the interpretation or execution of the treaty not settled by direct diplomatic negotiations, should be referred to the three heads of mission in Sofia.

## VIOLATIONS

such subtle methods as the substitution of collaborationist for existing church leaders or through such drastic procedures as those which resulted in the imprisonment of Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass (September 1948), Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty (February 1949), and hundreds of Catholic priests.

(c) Freedom of political opinion has been violated in Hungary by the forceful elimination of the entire Hungarian political opposition to the Communist-controlled government.

(d) After a process of gradual extermination freedom of public meeting totally disappeared almost simultaneously with the entry into force of the treaty. Since 1948 no political party outside the Communist-dominated coalition has been allowed to hold public meetings anywhere in Hungary.

(e) The judiciary has been subverted and now serves only the group in power. Through the establishment of the so-called people's and workers' courts, the resuscitation of summary courts, the abolition of existing courts, and the abrogation of the right of free choice of legal counsel, both Hungarians and foreigners have been deprived of the due process of law. Imprisonment, torture, deportation, and forced labor have become common practice.

2. Among the prewar treaties coming under the provisions of this article was the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation of 1925 between the United States and Hungary. Although the United States Government duly notified Hungary within the prescribed 6-month period that it desired to keep in force this bilateral treaty, the Hungarian Government has evaded and refused to fulfill its obligations in at least two instances. It seized United States property. It arrested two United States citizens, Vogeler and Jacobson, and held them incommunicado without access to United States consular officers.

3. On February 27, 1949, the Yugoslav Minister to Hungary delivered a note to the United States Legation in Budapest stating that the Hungarian Government had failed to abide by article 23 of the treaty and that, as a result of the ill will of the Hungarian Government the enforcement of article 23 could not be carried out by direct negotiations between the two governments. The Hungarian Government has to this day failed to comply with article 23 of the treaty. The Soviet Government has refused to participate in a meeting of the three heads of mission in Budapest, as provided by article 40 of the treaty.

4. The Hungarian Government has given no indication that it intends to compensate American citizens for property loss and war damage. On November 8, 1949, the United States Legation in Budapest transmitted to the Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs 4 new claims and additional evidence on 116 previous claims. Although receipt of the note was acknowledged, no action has been taken by the Hungarian Government to fulfill the 120 claims.

5. On August 1, 1949, and on January 5, 1950, the United States Government requested the Hungarian Government to designate its representative to a commission to be established for the settlement of a dispute arising under article 2 (the human-rights clause) of the treaty. On January 17, 1950, the Hungarian Government declared the formation of a commission to be unfounded and unnecessary.

## (B) Bulgaria

## Direct responsibility

On May 31, 1949, the United States requested the United Kingdom and the U. S. S. R. to convene a meeting of the three heads of missions in Sofia to settle the dispute over Bulgarian noncompliance with article 2 of the peace treaty. The Soviet Union in its note of June 11, 1949, refused

## AGREEMENTS

## Indirect responsibility

1. Under article 2 of the peace treaty, the Bulgarian Government has undertaken to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms.

2. By the terms of the peace treaty with Bulgaria the armed forces of the Bulgarians are limited to 55,000 land troops, including frontier troops, 1,800 antiaircraft personnel, 90 aircraft including reserves of which not more than 70 may be combat types, with a total personnel strength of 5,200. Bulgaria is prohibited from acquiring any aircraft designed primarily as bombers with internal bomb-carrying facilities. Also personnel in excess of these provisions must be disbanded within a period of 6 months after the treaty enters into effect. Personnel not included in the Army, Navy, or Air Force shall not receive any form of military, naval, or military training. Construction to the north of the Greco-Bulgarian frontier of permanent fortifications where weapons capable of firing into Greek territory can be employed is forbidden. Construction of permanent military installations capable of being used to direct or conduct fire into Greek territory is also forbidden. (Arts. 9, 10, 11, 12, pt. III, section, Treaty of Peace With Bulgaria.)

## (C) Rumania

## Direct responsibility

Articles 37 and 38 of the Rumanian Peace Treaty provided that the "Heads of the dip-

## VIOLATIONS

to convene the three heads of mission on the grounds that it "did not see any grounds for convening." The U. S. S. R. in the same note declared that "not only are the measures (of the Bulgarian Government) concerning which the United States of America has expressed its dissatisfaction not only not a violation of the peace treaty, but on the contrary are directed toward the fulfillment of the said treaties which obligate the said countries to combat organizations of the Fascist type." The United States note of June 30, 1949, confirmed the existence of a dispute between Bulgaria and the United States over the peace treaty. The Soviet memorandum of July 19, 1949, reaffirmed the Soviet contention that no basis for a meeting existed. The Soviet Union has consistently maintained its obduracy on this matter.

## Indirect responsibility

1. The U. S. S. R. has aided and abetted the Bulgarian Government in failing to fulfill article 2 of the peace treaty. In its note of June 11, 1949, Bulgaria specifically violated article 36 of the peace treaty by refusing to convene the three heads of mission to discuss the problem and work out a solution on the grounds that the "U. S. S. R. does not see any grounds for convening." The U. S. S. R., in its note of June 11, 1949, declared "that not only are the measures (of the Bulgarian Government) concerning which the Government of the United States of America expressed its dissatisfaction not only not a violation of the peace treaty, but on the contrary, are directed toward the fulfillment of said treaties which obligate the said countries to combat organizations of the Fascist type."

2. The U. S. S. R. has openly aided and abetted the Bulgarian Government in failing to fulfill completely and in completely ignoring these provisions of the peace treaty (arts. 9, 10, 11, and 12) in various ways.

The Soviet Union has openly aided and encouraged the Bulgarian Government to ignore the numerical limitations on the Bulgarian armed forces by supplying arms, ammunition, and equipment in excess of that needed for the force established by the treaty. In addition, the U. S. S. R. has by negative and extremely dilatory acts tolerated Bulgarian failure to disband these forces as required by article 10 of the peace treaty. The U. S. S. R., by the use of negative and obstructionist tactics aided and abetted the Bulgarian Government in the formation, maintenance, and training of para-military organizations, i. e., the militia, and the use of these organizations by the Bulgarians to violate both the spirit and the letter of article 2. The Soviet Government has also refused to participate in any conventions provided for in article 36 of the peace treaty to settle disputes over the interpretation or execution of the treaty. When the United States Government requested information on the Bulgarian armed forces (Note 263, March 5, 1948), the Bulgarian Government, with the tacit consent of the Soviet Union, was encouraged to deny the information. This was a violation of the right of the United States and United Kingdom under the treaty to request the information and confirm it by investigation. The Soviet note (No. 056 of February 16, 1948) declining the United States-United Kingdom invitation for a Soviet representative to participate in a proposed survey of the Greco-Bulgarian border is further evidence on this point. Moreover, the Bulgarian Government was encouraged by the Soviet Union to reply that, under the terms of the peace treaty, the matter should be referred to the United States, United Kingdom, and U. S. S. R. diplomatic missions.

## (C) Rumania

## Direct responsibility

Contrary to these provisions, the Soviet Government has consistently refused to co-

## AGREEMENTS

lomatic missions in Bucharest of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, acting in concert, will represent the Allied and Associated Powers in dealing with the Rumanian Government in all matters concerning the execution and interpretation of the present treaty" and that "any dispute concerning the interpretation or execution of the treaty which is not settled by diplomatic negotiations shall be referred to the three heads of the mission."

## Indirect responsibility

Under article 3 of the Peace Treaty the Rumanian Government has undertaken to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights and the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, political opinion, and public meeting.

## (D) Korea

1. In the Cairo Declaration of December 1943, the United States, the United Kingdom, and China pledged their determination that Korea would "in due course" become free and independent. This pledge was reaffirmed in the Potsdam Declaration of July 26, 1945, and was subscribed to by the Soviet Union when it declared war against Japan on August 8, 1945. The defeat of Japan made it possible for Korea to look forward to independence.

2. The Soviet Union and the United States agreed to reestablish movement of persons, motor, rail transport, and coastwise shipping; between the zones of North and South Korea (agreement of Joint United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Conference, January-February 1946).

## VIOLATIONS

operate with the American and British chiefs of mission in Bucharest and has in consequence reduced the treaty, repeatedly violated by the Rumanian Government, to a dead letter.

On May 4, 1948, the American Minister to Bucharest requested that an early meeting of the heads of the diplomatic missions in Bucharest be arranged to consider the implementation of the military clauses of the Treaty of Peace with Rumania. Both the Soviet and British chiefs of mission agreed to the meeting, which was scheduled for May 18, 1948. However, the Soviet Ambassador canceled the scheduled meeting because he was indisposed. On May 26, 1948, he informed the American Minister that there was no necessity for the proposed meeting and no grounds for putting the proposal into effect.

## Indirect responsibility

On April 2, 1949, the United States charged Rumania with a violation of article 3 of the peace treaty. As Rumania denied that it had violated the treaty and indicated its unwillingness to adopt the requested remedial measures, the United States informed Rumania that in its view a dispute had arisen over the interpretation and execution of the peace treaty. The United States invoked article 38 of the treaty providing for the settlement of such disputes by the heads of the diplomatic missions of the United States, United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union. On May 31, 1949, the United States chief of mission in Bucharest requested his Soviet and British colleagues to meet with him to consider the dispute. In a note of June 11 to the United States, the Soviet Union declined to authorize its representative to discuss the matter, stating that Rumania was fulfilling exactly its treaty obligations and that the United States was attempting to interfere in the internal affairs of Rumania. On June 30 the United States sent a further note to the Soviet Government declaring that the attitude of the Soviet Government showed its unwillingness to act in accordance with treaty procedures and represented an obstacle to the settlement of dispute. It asked the Soviet Government for reconsideration. In a note dated July 19, the Soviet Government refused to reconsider its position.

The Soviet Government refused to cooperate in the execution of the Peace Treaty and even encouraged Rumania to defy America in its requests for the implementation of the treaty. Thus, the Rumanian Government has systematically and willfully violated nearly all articles of the treaty, especially those dealing with human rights and military matters.

## (D) Korea

1. Every effort to give effect to this provision has been thwarted by the U. S. S. R. North of the 38th parallel, which has become a part of the Iron Curtain, the Soviet Union established a Communist regime. The formal creation of this regime, the so-called Democratic People's Republic of Korea," claiming jurisdiction over the entire country, was proclaimed on September 9, 1948. This aggressor regime has lived, as it was created, in complete defiance of the United Nations.<sup>1</sup>

2. The Soviet command in North Korea has since 1946 refused to discuss or implement the agreements reached on these matters, resisting efforts toward reestablishing the natural economic unity of the country. Concessions to economic coordination have been made only on a barter basis. No regularized movement of persons or transport has been established beyond that allowing the limited supply by the United States of its outposts accessible only by roads through Soviet-occupied territory.

<sup>1</sup> A full account of this situation will be found in the report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Background Information on Korea (H. Rept. 2495, 81st Cong.).

## AGREEMENTS

3. The Moscow agreement provided for consultation by the Joint United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Commission with "Korean democratic parties and social organizations" in the preparation of proposals for the formation of a provisional Korean government (Moscow agreement, December 27, 1945, III, 2).

4. The Joint United States and U. S. S. R. Commission agreed to consult with political groups "truly democratic in their aims and methods," who would declare their willingness to "uphold the aims of the Moscow decision," "abide by the decisions of the Joint Commission in . . . the formation of a provisional Korean government . . ." (Joint Commission communiqué No. 5, April 18, 1946).

5. A signature of communiqué No. 5 (later included in decision No. 12) will be accepted as a declaration of good faith with respect to upholding fully the Moscow agreement and will make the signatory party or organization eligible for consultation by the Joint Commissions. Such signatories who, after signing the communiqué, foment or instigate active opposition to the Joint Commission, the two powers, or the Moscow agreement, can be declared ineligible for consultation only by mutual agreement of the two delegations on the Joint Commission (exchange of letters between Secretary Marshall and Foreign Minister Molotov, May 2 through May 12, 1947, citing the November 26, 1946, December 24, 1946, exchange of letters between the Soviet and American commanders).

## (E) Iran

1. Article IV of the 1921 Soviet-Iranian Treaty of Friendship stated: "In consideration of the fact that each nation has the right to determine freely its political destiny, each of the two contracting parties formally expresses its desire to abstain from any intervention in the internal affairs of the other."

2. Article IV of the 1942 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics-United Kingdom-Iran Tripartite Treaty of Alliance stated: "It is understood that the presence of these forces [Soviet and British] on Iranian territory does not constitute a military occupation and will disturb as little as possible the administration and security forces of Iran, the economic life of the country, the normal movements of the populations, and the application of Iranian laws and regulations."

3. The Declaration of Teheran of December 1, 1943, stated: "The Governments of the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom are at one with the Government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran."

4. United Nations Charter, article 2, paragraph 4, states: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

5. Article II of the 1927 Soviet-Iranian Treaty of Friendship stated: "Each of the high contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggression and from any hostile acts directed against the other party, and not to introduce its military forces into the territory of the other party."

6. In article IV of the same treaty it stated that the U. S. S. R. and Iran undertook: "not to encourage or to allow in their respective territories the formation or activities of: (1) organizations or groups of any description whatever, whose object is to overthrow the government of the other contracting party by means of violence, insurrection, or outrage; (2) organizations or groups usurping the office of the government of the other country or of part of its territory, also hav-

## VIOLATIONS

3. The U. S. S. R. delegation on the Joint Commission consistently refused to allow such consultation except under unilateral interpretations of the phrase "democratic parties and social organizations," which, in each case, would exclude all but pro-Soviet political groups.

4. The U. S. S. R. delegation refused to consult with groups adhering to communiqué No. 5 if the representatives of the group had ever expressed opposition to the provision for placing Korea under the period of trusteeship envisaged in the Moscow agreement.

5. The U. S. S. R. delegation refused to adhere to the agreement when an attempt was made to schedule the party consultations. Despite the signature of communiqué No. 5, assurances of cooperation with the Commission, and a pledge to refrain from fomenting or instigating active opposition, the U. S. S. R. delegation unilaterally asserted that the members of a so-called antitrust committee could not be consulted by the Joint Commission.

## (E) Iran

1. The Soviet Government admitted in a note to the United States on November 29, 1945, that Soviet forces in Iran had prevented Iranian troops from taking action after the outbreak against the Iranian Government in northern Iran. This action constituted at least indirect Soviet aid to the Azerbaijan separatists and interference in the internal affairs of Iran.

2. Under the terms of the tripartite treaty, the U. S. S. R. pledged itself to respect the territorial integrity, sovereignty, and political independence of Iran, and to disturb as little as possible the administration and the security forces of Iran, the economic life of the country, and the application of Iranian laws and regulations. Violations of these pledges occurred both before and after the end of hostilities.

3. The U. S. S. R. expressed a desire in the Tehran Declaration for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter. By supporting the Azerbaijan separatists, while occupying Iran, and by its refusal to evacuate its troops except under United Nations pressure, the U. S. S. R. violated its commitment.

4. The Iranian appeal to the Security Council in January 1946 was based upon charges of Soviet interference in the internal affairs of Iran.

5. The U. S. S. R. has on repeated occasions violated this article by sending Soviet armed forces into Iranian territory.

6. Soviet broadcasts to Iran have repeatedly attacked the Iranian Government on false grounds, incited the Iranian people to violent action against it, and supported the illegal Tudeh Party.

## AGREEMENTS

ing as their object the subversion of the government of the other contracting party by the above-mentioned means, a breach of its peace and security, or an infringement of its territorial integrity."

## (F) Japan

1. Potsdam declaration defining terms for Japanese surrender (July 26, 1945).

The Potsdam declaration stipulates that "Japanese military forces, after being completely disarmed, shall be permitted to return to their homes with an opportunity to lead peaceful productive lives."

2. Geneva Prisoners of War Convention signed on December 8, 1949, by U. S. S. R.

This convention sets forth the rights and obligations of countries holding prisoners of war.

## (G) Manchuria

1. "The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance in the postwar period with a view to facilitating and accelerating reconstruction in both countries and to contributing to the cause of world prosperity" (Sino-Soviet Treaty and agreements of August 14, 1945, art. VI).

2. " \* \* \* In accordance with the spirit of the aforementioned treaty, and in order to put into effect its aims and purposes, the Government of the U. S. S. R. agrees to render to China moral support and aid in military supplies and other material resources, such support and aid to be entirely given to the National Government as the Central Government of China. \* \* \*

"In the course of conversations \* \* \* the Government of the U. S. S. R. regarded the three eastern provinces (i. e., Manchuria) as part of China" (note of V. M. Molotov, August 14, 1945, relating to the treaty of friendship and alliance).

3. "The administration of Dairen shall belong to China" (agreement concerning Dairen of August 14, 1945).

Mr. KNOWLAND. In weighing judgments as to the advisability of any meeting at the summit without a demonstration by deeds rather than by words, I think it will be of interest to the Senate and to the country to note the consistent record of violations by the Soviet Union of all agreements entered into by it.

# TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ANDREW W. MELLON

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, 100 years ago today Andrew W. Mellon was born in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.

I call this centennial anniversary to the attention of my colleagues in order to pay tribute to the greatness of this distinguished American and to recall his outstanding service to the United States and the world.

Andrew Mellon was a builder who worked constantly and courageously to create a better, happier, and more prosperous America. His father, Thomas Mellon, was a poor Scotch-Irish immigrant. He had no social or economic background when he came to America, but he had other assets of great value. He brought courage, honesty, integrity, strength of character, and the will to work.

He cherished the principles of America, individual freedom and opportunity.

## VIOLATIONS

## (F) Japan

On April 22, 1950, Tass announced that the Soviet Government had completed the repatriation of Japanese "prisoners of war" from its territories, except for 2,467 men charged with war crimes or under medical treatment. However, Supreme Commander Allied Powers (SCAP) and Japanese Government figures show that as of that date 369,382 Japanese prisoners of war and civilians remained under Soviet control still unrepatriated or unaccounted for. The discrepancy is explicable either by continued detention of Japanese prisoners or an abnormally high death rate.

## (G) Manchuria

1. Department of State press release No. 907 of December 13, 1946, citing Pauley report, stated that "Industry \* \* \* (in the three eastern provinces, also known as Manchuria) \* \* \* was directly damaged to the extent of \$858,000,000 during Soviet occupancy \* \* \*. The greatest part of the damage to the Manchurian industrial complex \* \* \* was primarily due to Soviet removals of equipment."

2. The Chinese Government failed to receive from the U. S. S. R. the promised military supplies and other material resources called for by the treaty of 1945. On the other hand when Soviet troops left Manchuria, there is strong evidence that they allowed the Chinese Communists to take over substantial quantities of Japanese arms and assume control over the area. Chinese Government troops attempting to enter Manchuria subsequent to the Japanese surrender were denied the right to land at Dairen by the Soviet authorities there and were forced to use less advantageous landing points.

3. Due in large part to Soviet obstructionism, China was unable to establish a government administration at Dairen.

The same fine characteristics descended to his four sons.

From his early youth, Andrew Mellon prepared for a life of usefulness. He regarded the fortune committed to his care as a tool with which to expand industrial enterprise, to create new products for the benefit of mankind, to broaden employment opportunities for our working men and women, and to make a richer, fuller life for the community and the Nation.

He was a courageous pioneer of the industrial frontier. He had the vision to appreciate the tremendous opportunities and the rich rewards that were possible under the American system of free enterprise.

His genius contributed to the growth and development of many basic industries, such as oil, steel, chemicals, coal, and aluminum—all of them adding to the material strength of our Nation and the prosperity of our people.

Closely associated with Andrew Mellon in the rise of the family industrial and banking interests was his younger brother, Richard B. Mellon, who also found time in his busy life for participation in public affairs, in educational activities, and in the church.

Today the honorable traditions and the responsibilities of the Mellon family are carried forward by Gen. Richard K. Mellon, able and public-spirited son of Richard B. Mellon.

Andrew Mellon presided over a widespread industrial empire, but I would place greater emphasis on another phase of his long and honorable career. I would express deeper and more grateful appreciation of his vast contribution to the spiritual and cultural progress of the United States.

He was a modest man. Personal publicity was distasteful to him. In this connection I recall an incident that occurred when he was planning to make a princely gift to the people of the United States.

Several years before he announced his intention to build a magnificent center of art here in Washington he revealed his plan to me.

I congratulated Mr. Mellon and remarked that the Mellon Gallery of Art would be an everlasting monument to his memory as well as a source of cultural inspiration for generations far into the future.

But Mr. Mellon shook his head. He said he would not permit his name to be applied to the project he had in mind. He would prefer—in fact he would make it a condition of his gift—that it be designated as the National Gallery of Art, in order that others might contribute their art treasures to make the gallery truly national in character.

This unselfish desire on the part of Mr. Mellon has been fulfilled in the priceless collections that have been added, including those of Samuel H. Kress, Joseph H. Widener, Chester Dale, the Lessing J. Rosenwald collection of prints, and gifts of painting and sculpture from many other donors.

Mr. Mellon's interest in beauty extended to the city of Washington and he pushed forward with his accustomed vigor a plan to make it one of the most impressive and most beautiful capitals of the world.

His plan contemplated the erection of monumental buildings and broad avenues to make Washington a center of pride and patriotism. It was Andrew Mellon's urging that prompted President Coolidge to include in his last annual message to Congress a plea for a more beautiful Capital City. In that message President Coolidge said:

If our country wishes to compete with others, let it not be in the support of armaments, but in the making of a beautiful Capital City. Let it express the soul of America. Whenever an American is at the seat of his Government, however traveled or cultured he may be, he ought to find a city of stately proportions, symmetrically laid out and adorned with the best there is in architecture which would arouse his imagination and stir his patriotic pride.

Congress authorized the program and appropriated the necessary funds, placing the responsibility for its execution in the hands of Mr. Mellon as Secretary of the Treasury. The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Andrew Mellon for the dignity and beauty that is now the pride of every American who visits the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Mellon's distinguished public service as Secretary of the Treasury under three Presidents began in 1921, at a time when great financial problems were pressing upon the Nation.

We had just emerged from World War I. War expenditures had pushed the national debt up to \$24 billion, the highest level up to that time in our history. Taxes were at the highest point ever levied by any nation.

It is interesting to note that the cost of operating the Federal Government in 1921 was about \$5 billion. This brought a warning from Secretary Mellon.

"The Nation cannot continue to spend at this shocking rate," he declared. "The Nation's finances are sound and its credit is the best in the world," he continued, "but it cannot afford reckless or wasteful expenditures."

Andrew Mellon applied to public finance the same sound principles which had been so successful in his private business. By prudent management the budget was balanced and high wartime taxes were reduced. Year after year during Secretary Mellon's tenure in office saw a reduction in the national debt, from \$24 billion in 1921 to less than \$17 billion in 1931.

His career in public service was brought to a climax by his appointment by President Hoover as Ambassador to Great Britain, a post in which he served with honor and distinction.

But the work instituted by Andrew Mellon and other members of his family continues to benefit mankind through their generous gifts for the advancement of education and scientific research having a direct relationship to human welfare.

Outstanding among these are the Mellon Institute in the city of Pittsburgh, founded by Andrew Mellon and his brother, Richard B. Mellon, as a memorial to their father, and the A. W. Mellon Education and Charitable Trust, established in 1930.

Andrew W. Mellon passed away on August 27, 1937, in his 82d year. His memory should be honored by all Americans in recognition of his brilliant record of achievement, his unselfish devotion to the public good, his unfailing adherence to sound principles in government, and his outstanding place as a benefactor of mankind.

#### COMPLETING THE GREAT LAKES ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the winter, 1955, issue of the Heartland magazine, published by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, three important comments on issues involving the future of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

The first was an editorial, soundly emphasizing the importance of expanding the capacity of the Welland Canal. This editorial also stressed the vital significance of deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels, an objective for which, I for one, am striving in the form of my bill, S. 171, now pending before the Senate Public Works Committee.

Elsewhere in that issue was a fine article by Mr. F. Hugh Burns indicating the role of the connecting channels in realizing the full potentialities of the seaway.

Finally, there is an important statement by Dr. N. R. Danielian, editor and

publisher of the Heartland, which expertly describes seaway traffic potentialities.

I send to the desk the text of the material which I believe represents most helpful contributions to the seaway's future, under the Wiley law, Public Law 358, of the 83d Congress. I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### THE FINISHING TOUCHES

The surveys for the seaway have been made, engineers have been sounding the river bottoms, and the first cofferdams have been put in place. The St. Lawrence Seaway dream is beginning to be realized.

Before the full results of the seaway can be achieved, however, there is work to be done.

The problem of the Welland Canal deserves attention. For all States west of Lake Ontario the capacity of the seaway is limited by the capacity of the Welland. Present estimates indicate that because of these limitations, only an additional 5 to 6 million tons of general cargo traffic will be available for division among all the ports—both Canadian and American—on Lakes Erie, Huron, Superior, and Michigan. In other words, the much-hoped-for boom in the export-import trade to and from Great Lakes ports will be of minor proportions. It is our hope, therefore, that the Canadian Government can be persuaded to consider, in the not too distant future, the duplication of the single locks in the Welland Canal.

It would be possible to wait before definite steps are taken concerning this expansion if only commercial considerations were involved. From the point of view of national security of both countries, however, this problem may have to be confronted earlier. Should a national emergency develop, Great Lakes steel mills might be forced to step up shipments of Labrador ore even beyond the capacity of the present Welland Canal.

There is another bit of unfinished business which will be before the Congress of the United States, and that is the deepening of the connecting channels, so that 27-foot navigation can be brought to Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, as well as the Canadian cities in western Ontario. The present navigation channels are restricted to 21 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound in the Detroit, St. Clair, and Sault Ste. Marie Rivers.

This problem is of interest to all the Great Lakes ports. It is our impression that the extent of service and the number of ships that will be willing to use the seaway, and the number of ports that will be serviced directly, will depend upon the capacity of these ships to go into any of the major Great Lakes ports for available business without undue inconvenience. Thus, by supporting the deepening of these channels, all Great Lakes ports can assist in increasing the volume and diversity of foreign shipping involved in lake trade.

These problems deserve the close attention and support of all seaway enthusiasts.

#### COMPLETING THE SEAWAY

(By F. Hugh Burns)

In the spring 1954 issue of the Heartland, Vice Adm. Lyndon Spencer, United States Coast Guard, retired, and president of the Lake Carriers Association, Cleveland, Ohio, described in graphic terms the vital importance of the Great Lakes connecting channels not only to the Great Lakes region but to the country as a whole.

At that time, a new survey and up-to-date cost estimate by the Corps of Engineers to

deepen and improve these channels was in its final phase in the office of the district engineer at Detroit. Since then, a favorable report, giving ample economic justification for this project, has been rendered by Col. Arthur C. Nauman, district engineer, approved by Col. Wendell P. Trower, division engineer at Chicago, and forwarded to the Chief of Engineers. He, in turn, submitted it to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

This Board unanimously approved it at a meeting on January 20, 1955, including the alternate plan for the cut-off channel in Canada at the southeast bend of the St. Clair River. It also approved, in addition, the improving of the south canal's westerly approach to the locks at St. Mary's, and an increase in its depth of 1 foot at an estimated cost of \$1,300,000. As finally approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the total estimated cost of this improvement project will be:

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| Main project for deepening and improving        | \$109,027,000 |
| Alternate proposal, SE. bend St. Clair River    | 5,615,000     |
| Additional improving and deepening at St. Marys | 1,300,000     |
| Total estimated cost                            | 115,942,000   |

The report will now be sent to the Governors of the affected States, viz, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York, as well as to any Government agencies, that may have an interest. They are permitted a period of 90 days in which to make such suggestions or comment as they may deem necessary. Upon receipt of their replies, it then goes to the Chief of Engineers for his action, endorsement and transmittal to the 84th Congress.

The study recommends that the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels be modified to provide for deepening and improving the channels in St. Mary's River, Straits of Mackinac, St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and the Detroit River, to provide for increasing the controlling depths in the upbound and downbound channels, which are now 21 feet and 25 feet, respectively, to 27 feet.

The plan for improvement of these channels includes deepening the westerly 300 feet of the 500-foot upbound Middle Neebish Channel in the St. Marys River to a minimum depth of 27 feet; also the deepening of the westerly 300 feet of the Amherstburg Channel in the Detroit River from the presently authorized but unconstructed depth of 27 feet to 27.5 and 28.5 feet for various reaches. The deepening to 27.5 feet will be for the full channel width of the upper portion of the Amherstburg Channel, where cross currents create a serious navigation problem.

The total cost of this improvement is estimated at \$109,027,000.

The report also recommends that the alternate plan for the cut-off channel in Canada at the Southeast Bend, St. Clair River, be authorized for construction in lieu of further improvement of the existing river channel. This would involve an additional cost of \$5,615,000 over that for deepening the existing river channel included in the plan of improvement above. If this further recommendation is accepted, it would make the total cost of the project \$114,642,000.

If the plan recommended is approved and authorized, the controlling depths of the Great Lakes connecting channels will then be commensurate with the 27-foot depth project authorized for the St. Lawrence Seaway from Montreal to Lake Erie, thus bringing the new deep water channel through to the head of the lakes at Duluth.

The engineers' study of the economic benefits to be derived from this improvement reveals some interesting facts which serve to

emphasize the vital importance and need for the authorization of the project at this time.

In 1953 the total tonnage of all Great Lakes traffic amounted to 242,612,000 tons. Of this total, 32,855,000 tons were imports and exports (mostly involving Canada) and the remaining 209,757,000 tons were domestic.

Prospective commerce through the connecting channels has been estimated as follows:

|                | Tons        |
|----------------|-------------|
| Iron ore.....  | 82,000,000  |
| Coal.....      | 66,000,000  |
| Grain.....     | 5,800,000   |
| Stone.....     | 35,000,000  |
| Petroleum..... | 3,900,000   |
| Total.....     | 192,700,000 |

The engineers found that the estimated annual charges, based on a 2½ percent interest rate and sinking fund amortization over a period of 50 years would be \$4,250,000.

These channel improvements will bring a reduction in per ton transportation costs of bulk carriers from \$1.02 at present to 87 cents, a saving of 15 cents, or approximately 15 percent; on self-unloaders from 81 cents to 63 cents, a saving of 18 cents, or approximately 22 percent. It has been further estimated that the annual operating cost of the entire fleet, with a capacity of 178,700,000 tons, would be reduced from \$176,600,000 to \$149,100,000.

Total transportation savings over a 50-year period are estimated at \$279,800,000. The total annual equivalent of transportation savings over the economic life of the project is estimated at \$9,868,000. Of this amount, 77 percent, or \$7,600,000, can be credited to the proposed improvement of the channels as set forth in the report. This is equivalent to a benefit-cost ratio of 1.78 to 1, or \$1.78 in benefits for every dollar of annual cost.

#### WELLAND'S CAPACITY

(By N. R. Danielian)

I shall address myself to two questions: How much more in shipping can you expect as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway project; and how different will it be in comparison with present traffic and types of ships? The waterborne commerce on the Great Lakes was 256 million tons in the 1953 navigation season. Will this waterborne commerce increase in tonnage specifically as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, and, if so, by how much and in what period of time?

An analysis of the Great Lakes commerce indicates that, with the exception of some 500,000 tons of export-import business to overseas points, which is but one-fifth of 1 percent of the total waterborne commerce of the Great Lakes, most of the rest of this business was in bulk industrial commodities such as iron ore, coal, gravel, oil, and grain products.

I know of no way of projecting, with any exactitude, the year-by-year raw material requirements of an expanding industry in the Great Lakes area. You will just have to keep an ear close to the ground and watch the trends of industrial concentration. You can anticipate a trend in favor of the Great Lakes area, but you cannot measure its future magnitude. A good deal will depend upon the initiative of the people in the various communities in making this area attractive to industrial expansion. Any so-called economist that tells you otherwise is kidding the unwary.

As to what form of shipping this expansion may require, I think, by and large, it is safe to say that present-type lake shipping will be the backbone of this business insofar as Canadian and United States sources both in the Northeast and the Northwest are the origin of the raw materials. There will be perhaps a greater use of ocean shipping to bring such raw materials where

African, South American, or even perhaps east coast United States sources of supply, such as phosphate from Florida, may be brought in for local industry.

Whether this Great Lakes trade will cause the design and construction of a new-type ship which will be just as economical on the Great Lakes during the open season of navigation and just as seaworthy on the high seas all year round, I leave it to you gentlemen to decide.

It appears, therefore, that the demand for raw material transportation facilities will grow gradually, in the natural course of industrial development, but that, by and large, this will not create a revolutionary change in the types of ships and the port facilities that will be required.

There is one type of business that will be new to the Great Lakes area, both in quantity and in the type of ships that will ply these waters. That is the export-import trade in general cargo. It is true that we now have ships of small size drawing at full load 19 feet of water, restricted to about 250 feet in length and 42 feet in width which pick up cargo on the Great Lakes up to about 1,500 tons and go down the St. Lawrence canals drawing 14 feet of water. These will be replaced in time by larger ships, depending on the particular routes and types of cargoes for which these are built, carrying 7,000 to 10,000 tons. You are aware that some foreign shipping lines are already constructing boats adapted to this traffic, and I am informed that American Shipping Lines have design of ships for this trade under consideration.

I think you can expect this trade to grow with the opening of the seaway. Again, it will take time to make all the adjustments of services, facilities, and shipping, but it is likely to grow, perhaps within our own generation, from the present 520,000 tons a year to possibly 5 million tons a year—a ten-fold growth, which is the Canadian Government's estimate.

When this will come is hard to tell. Some estimates put it at within 5 years of the opening of the seaway. This trade, however, will be carried on during a season of 244 days, on the average, through all the ports of the Great Lakes area. Compare it with an annual export-import figure in general cargo other than bulk commodities from New York harbor alone, which in 1953 was 13,519,975 tons.

This business will definitely be incremental new business. It will probably involve new types of ships, in addition to those already mentioned, such as the proposed roll-on, roll-off type ships which the Defense Department and the Maritime Administration have under design for transport of automotive equipment. Five million tons is not large, but it is 10 times as large as what we have at present.

#### AMENDMENT OF COTTON-MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3952) to amend the cotton-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] for himself, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLALLAN], and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], as a substitute for the language beginning on page 3, line 10, and extending down to and including the word "therein" on page 4, line 3. This amendment, under Senate procedure, is in the first degree.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina rose.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] that the amendment I have offered is under the present parliamentary situation, the pending question, and I wish to make a very brief factual statement.

The amendment provides an increase of 271,000 acres. The Senate committee amendment as originally reported carries 258,000 acres. So that the acreage is almost the same.

The Senate committee amendment to be proposed today will carry 168,000 acres, while the House bill carries an additional acreage of 544,000.

Mr. President, I wish to point out the distressing situation and the need for some acreage relief which has been recognized by the Department of Agriculture. It has also been recognized by the House of Representatives and by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The only difference is as to the method of meeting distress cases and to what extent we should go.

In view of those facts, Mr. President, I am willing to have the question voted on after a brief factual statement or such statement as the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may wish to make. I think orderly procedure, as well as the merits of the case, commends the idea of getting the facts and then letting every Senator vote as he sees fit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which is reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning in line 17, with the word "further", it is proposed to strike out through the word "subsection" in line 20, and to insert the following: "such further additional acreage, in the case of Illinois and Nevada, as may be necessary to increase the allotment of each such State to 3,500 acres."

On page 4, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Whenever it is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture that because of drought or other abnormal weather conditions, any part of a cotton-acreage allotment for any farm cannot be planted to cotton in 1955, such acreage allotment may in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary be transferred by the owner or operator of such farm to another farm where water or moisture is available and which has been owned or leased and operated by such owner or operator for a period of 1 year

prior to the transfer of the allotment: *Provided, however*, That no such transfer shall be made from a dryland farm to an irrigated farm. Any allotment transferred under this provision and planted to cotton on another farm shall be regarded for the purposes of subsection 344 as having been planted to cotton on the farm from which such allotment was transferred rather than to the farm to which the allotment is transferred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered has been proposed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The committee met yesterday after the matter had been discussed on the Senate floor. The amendment was adopted by the committee by a vote of 9 to 1. It strikes out a provision increasing each State allotment by one-half of 1 percent. It increases the allotments of Illinois and Nevada to 3,500 acres, and adds to the committee amendment the amendment which was intended to be proposed by the Senators from Texas because of the drought situation there. It does not increase the allotment which was originally proposed by the Department of Agriculture. It would permit a producer who, because of drought or other abnormal weather condition, cannot plant his 1955 allotment to transfer his allotment to another farm owned or operated by him where moisture is available, no such transfer to be made from a dryland farm to an irrigated farm.

The total additional acreage provided by the bill as amended by this amendment would be 169,603.8 acres. This is the amount shown in the committee report for each State, except Illinois and Nevada, as being required to increase each farm allotment to the smaller of 4 acres, or 75 percent of the highest acreage planted in 1952, 1953, or 1954; 444 acres in the case of Illinois and 1,176 acres in the case of Nevada.

We think it provides sufficient acreage so that they may have a cotton gin.

I believe the committee voted unanimously for those particular items.

If there are any questions regarding the amendment, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I learned only a little while ago that the committee had acted and had recommended an additional amendment to the bill under consideration. Is it the intention of the Senator from South Carolina to call up the amendment first and have a vote on it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It comes up first. The committee has proposed an amendment to perfect the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I came late to the floor because I have been in attendance on a meeting of a Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs. May I ask the Senator if he has an extra copy of his amendment, so that I may look at it?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will advise the Senator

from California that the parliamentary procedure is that since the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi seeks to strike out and insert, and the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina proposes merely to perfect language now contained in the committee amendment, under rule XVIII the perfecting language takes precedence, and the vote, when it occurs, will be first on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina before the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi can be acted upon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Action on the amendment I have offered will not prevent an amendment to the bill later.

Mr. KUCHEL. I now have a typewritten copy of the statement explaining the proposed amendment. The Senator from South Carolina suggests, first, that the amendment would strike out the provision increasing each State allotment by one-half of 1 percent.

If I understand correctly the intentment of that particular part of the new amendment, it would eliminate column 3 of the table set forth on page 2 of the report of the committee dated March 8, 1955.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In effect, it simply eliminates the one-half of 1 percent provision and substitutes in lieu thereof what is proposed in perfecting the amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Second, the amendment would increase the allotment of Illinois and Nevada to 3,500 acres each.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is so.

Mr. KUCHEL. Unless the second provision in the perfecting amendment were included, Illinois and Nevada would receive only 15 acres and 12 acres, respectively, would they not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. The committee felt that these two States should have a sufficient amount to provide for a cotton gin. Illinois now has 3,056 acres. As the Senator will notice, 444 acres would be added to the Illinois acreage.

The additional amount allotted to Nevada is 1,156 acres.

Mr. KUCHEL. With respect to the third recommended change, I again refer to the typewritten explanation, which reads:

Add to the committee amendment the amendment which was intended to be proposed by the Senators from Texas, which would permit a producer who cannot plant his 1955 allotment because of drought or other abnormal weather conditions to transfer his allotment to another farm owned or operated by him where moisture is available, no such transfer to be made from a dryland farm to an irrigated farm.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That gives to no State any additional acreage; but if a farmer owns two different farms, he can transfer from one to the other, but not from a dryland farm to an irrigated farm, or from an irrigated farm to a dryland farm.

Mr. KUCHEL. May I ask the Senator from South Carolina if there is any provision as to the length of time which a farmer would be required to own the property, in order to be eligible under the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. He must have owned it for 1 year prior to the request being made.

Mr. KUCHEL. Specifically, would one of the effects of the amendment be to eliminate the State of California from any additional acreage?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Not if California comes under the proposal. Of course, all States are treated on the same basis. I do not believe California would get any additional acreage.

Mr. KUCHEL. What other States would be in a position similar to that of California under the amendment which has been offered this morning?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not think any other State would be in a position similar to that of California.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there would be no other State in the position of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Do I understand correctly that California is the only State whose acreage is reduced to zero?

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason for that is that California has no small farms of this size needing relief; according to my information all the farms in California are larger farms than those receiving additional acreage under the committee amendment now pending before the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Why are Illinois and Nevada being increased to 3,500 acres each?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The only reason is to provide them with a sufficient amount of acreage to enable them to have cotton gins.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for answering my questions. I desire to have an opportunity to study the text of the amendment, although now I think I recognize its implications. Later this afternoon I should like to discuss the matter at greater length.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina relinquish the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I relinquish the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry met for the purpose of trying to draft a provision which would be acceptable to all the cotton-producing States. Soon after our meeting, it was apparent that this could not be done.

What the committee finally agreed to do was what the Senator from South Carolina has just stated, namely, to take care of small farmers only.

As I stated previously, were it not for the fact that the committee finds it necessary to provide sufficient acreage to take care of 182,847 distressed small farmers, the bill would not be before the Senate.

The bill when it was originally reported to the Senate provided, as the Senator from South Carolina has just stated, additional allotments for small farmers plus one-half of one percent of each State's allotment, so as to make available to all the cotton-producing States a certain fixed acreage in proportion to the present 1955 allotment of each State. When the committee met

yesterday, it decided to provide only the acres necessary in order to take care of the 182,847 distressed small farmers. We voted to confine the relief to bona fide hardship cases.

If the bill is enacted, it will mean that the small farmer, be he in the West, the South, or the Southwest, will receive the smaller of 4 acres, or 75 percent of the highest number of acres he planted in any one of the years 1952, 1953, or 1954. The purpose of the bill is simply and solely to take care of the 182,847 small cotton farmers of this Nation.

It is true that under the law some of the States which did not do so could have provided relief for their small farmers. Many States did their best to provide for all their small farmers; but, because of the acreage limitation, they found the number of allotted acres to be inadequate to take care of them. All that the bill seeks to do is to correct that situation.

It is also true that in several States some of the committees did not set aside even 1 acre in order to take care of small farmers. But let us not blame the small farmers for that; they are not responsible; they should not be punished.

It strikes me that what Congress should do, and soon, is to force the States to make the allocations provided for in the present law, rather than to allow the allocations to be more or less optional. If such a mandatory provision were now in the law, the pending bill might not be before the Senate today, except for the necessity of providing such additional acreage as may be necessary—and that is what we are now asking for—to enable each farmer to have a minimum of 4 acres, or 75 percent of the highest acreage he planted in either 1952, 1953, or 1954.

I think the bill is fair and just. I am satisfied that if a bill of this character were passed by the Senate, the President, and also, I feel certain, the Department of Agriculture, would favor it, because its purpose is to take care of a real hardship problem.

It is my hope that the Senate will stand back of the recommendations made after careful study by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, time is running out, and unless we act today, it may be too late no matter what the Senate does, because in many of the States farmers have already started planting cotton. Yesterday we were notified by Mr. Rhodes, of the Department of Agriculture, that any allocations other than those necessary to take care of the small farmers would require from 4 to 5 weeks before the calculations could be made and the acreage allotted to farmers. But as to the allocations for the small farmers, numbering 182,847, the calculations could be completed within 10 days. So, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to act on the amendment favorably, and without delay.

When the Senate passes the bill, as every Senator knows, it will have to go to conference with the House. How long it will take to complete work on the bill, I do not know, but I feel confident we may have a battle on hand, because our bill seeks to protect the small farmers

only, whereas the House bill seeks to give to each State 3 percent of its allotment, with only a few exceptions.

I urge the Senate to follow the recommendations made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all, I should like to have the Senator tell the Senate on what theory he originally recommended, as a part of the bill, that an increase of one-half percent of the present allotment be given to several cotton-growing States.

Mr. ELLENDER. The subcommittee made a recommendation of 1 percent, and the full committee made it one-half percent. To be frank with the Senator, some members of the committee had in mind that by providing some acreage for the States in addition to that required for small farms, further support might be obtained for the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. In other words, the Senator is suggesting that the bill was originally reported by the committee to the Senate in such a way that others might be attracted to its cause, so that it might be adopted by the Senate, is he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my statement as a Senator. I do not wish to impugn the good faith of any Senator, but I think Senators who were there will bear me out that many of us preferred to allocate the acreage in order to take care of the small farmers only, and we reached that decision because of the reaction the subcommittee had when it took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture. In conversation with the representatives of the Department we were informed there would be no serious opposition from the Department if the bill provided only for a sufficient number of acres to take care of the small farmers. Because of that fact, we met again yesterday. What prompted the change, and probably the attitude of some Senators, was the fact that time is growing late. As a matter of fact, some Senators had several conversations with representatives of the Department of Agriculture, and were informed that if any additional acreage were provided to take care of farmers other than small farmers, it would require from 4 to 5 weeks before the size of the additional allotments to be granted to the various States could be ascertained, whereas in the case of the allotments to the small farmers it would require only 10 days. It may be that is what prompted many of the Senators to favor a bill providing relief only for the small farmers.

I repeat what I said yesterday and today, that except for the necessity of relieving bona fide hardship cases, and in order to assist our distressed small farmers, the bill would not be before the Senate today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that when the subcommittee reported the bill with a 1-percent provision, many of the Senators on the committee took the position that, with in excess of 250,000 acres provided for in the bill, there might be opposition from the Department?

Mr. ELLENDER. I heard mentioned the figure 250,000 acres and I heard the figure 200,000 acres. That, added to the other factors, made some of us take the position that the acreage should be reduced to such a point that, if the bill were submitted to the Department, it would receive the approval of the Department, and in turn the signature of the President.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana referred to the fact that several Senators who were members of the committee called Department personnel regarding the time and detail which would be involved in order to put the measure into effect. I was one of those Senators. In substance, the information we received was that if the relief—and this is a relief bill—as reported by the committee—was confined entirely to farmers who were in the 4-acre category, or, if their maximum planting for the last 3 years had been less than 4 acres, then 75 percent of their largest planting, calculations could be started at once. The States would be notified and then the counties. The data could be prepared at once, and the calculations would not be difficult. In the meantime, the new regulations could be formulated and published, just as speedily as possible, in the Federal Register. The whole matter could be moving in 10 days to 2 weeks.

On the other hand, if any other provisions were contained in the bill, such as a provision for an additional one-half percent, 1 percent, 1½ percent, or 3 percent, as proposed by the House bill, in the acreage for each State, the work would involve a much longer process, in that each State would have to be advised, and would have to report back to Washington as to how the acreage would be broken down, and the final action of the Department would have to await the completion of those reports. The time required would be doubled, or possibly a great deal more than doubled by reason of that fact. If the desire was to afford relief, it was not only apparent that the simple process of aiding only the very small farmers would bring quick relief, but that any other method would defeat quick relief. That was the substance of the statement made to me by the appropriate official of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. What was the purpose of including the 3,500-acre provision, bringing up the allotments for Illinois and Nevada?

Mr. ELLENDER. As was stated by the Senator from South Carolina, and as was stated by some other committee

members, the main purpose of that increase was to provide enough cotton production in Nevada to maintain a cotton gin.

Mr. KUCHEL. Did the Senator consider that an urgent situation?

Mr. ELLENDER. We were told that if that were not done, any cotton produced in Nevada would probably have to be transported to California, a distance of more than 300 miles over rugged mountain roads. That is what prompted the committee to act as it did on that particular provision, and there was no other reason for it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, whether I correctly understood his statement. Did he say that under the present law, last year each State could have made its allocations to the 4-acre farms if it wished to do so?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not say that.

Mr. KUCHEL. What did the Senator from Louisiana say?

Mr. ELLENDER. I said most States made special allocations to the small farms, but some States did not have sufficient acreage to allot each farmer the minimum of 4 acres or 75 percent of the 3 last years' plantings.

Mr. KUCHEL. I think the Senator from Louisiana will recall that during the subcommittee hearings the statement was made that in some States there was maladministration.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know about maladministration; but there were some States—I think California was one of them—which made no provision for small farms, and I presume that is because those States do not have any small farms. I think the State of Mississippi made no such provision. But that is not the point. The point I am making to my good friend, the Senator from California, is this: why should the small farmers be blamed and even penalized because the administrators of the law do not carry it out as it should have been carried out? It strikes me, as I said a while ago, that what the committee should do—and I propose to try to do it in the immediate future—is to make the administrators carry out the law in the spirit in which it was intended.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me say, first of all, that California made complete provision for the small farmers.

Mr. ELLENDER. In this statement I have from the Department, that is not reflected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the statement reveal that California set aside 10 percent of its reserves for small farms, which was adequate for its small farms?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement does not reveal that? Then what does it reveal?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am quoting the statement in regard to 4-acre farms. It may be that California considers a 50-acre or 100-acre farm a small one. But in the 4-acre size we are trying to

help, a 50- or 100-acre farm is a large one. As the Senator from New Mexico knows, 4-acre farms are prevalent in the South, although that situation does not prevail in California or New Mexico. I assume that accounts for the fact that in the table appearing on page 2 of the committee report there is a big zero opposite California, as to 4-acre farms.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; as to 4-acre farms.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the testimony was that California had set aside for small farms 10 percent of its State reserve, and had allotted it to small farms, and that it was adequate for the purpose.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana knows, not much cotton is raised in North Dakota. However, I am interested in knowing whether the Senator from Louisiana would apply the same formula to wheat. For example, in North Dakota a small farmer may have 160 acres of wheat; but under the allotment plan, he might be allowed to seed only 30, 31, or 32 acres of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill does not deal with that subject.

Mr. LANGER. However, if the Senators from North Dakota were to introduce such a bill, would the Senator from Louisiana be willing to say that the small farmer, having 160 acres, should not have his allocation reduced?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course it would depend on the facts developed. I assure the Senator from North Dakota that if such a bill were introduced, I would certainly appoint a subcommittee—if I were instructed to do so—to hold hearings in the same manner that the subcommittee proceeded to hold hearings on the bill dealing with cotton farmers. If justification were shown for the enactment of such a bill, I am sure the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would give the bill adequate consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I believe this measure is an extremely important piece of proposed legislation, which ought to have very careful consideration by the Congress.

I believe that the action taken yesterday by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, revising its amendment and in trying to limit the relief it gives to the areas east of the Mississippi River, with the small exception of a few acres allocated to Nevada—which I heartily concur—was improper. I believe I should say frankly that I was the only member of the committee who voted against it; for the vote was 9 to 1.

I hope the Members of the Senate will take a good look at the table which I inserted at page 3536 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It shows that the great State of California, which steadily runs a close competition with the State of Iowa as to being the greatest agricultural State in the Union, would get exactly zero acres by the action of the committee, because California could not come down to a 4-acre formula and be able to show 4-acre farms still needing help.

It happens that we must consider the type of agriculture which exists in the particular areas with which we are concerned. In an irrigated section it is not possible to operate a 4-acre farm with any possibility of success, insofar as cotton production is concerned, because cotton farming in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and the western part of Texas is mechanized. One cannot afford to buy a flamethrower or a 4-row cultivator, or a diesel tractor to pull that equipment, and operate with only 4 acres of cotton. So one who says the only measure of hardship he will consider is whether a farmer has or does not have 4 acres, is admitting in the beginning that he wishes to be unfair.

Mr. President, what happened at the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry? The committee decided that certain States would have their acreage increased; for instance, Florida, 15 percent; Illinois, 14 percent, and, incidentally, that increase amounts to only 400 acres; Kansas, 5 percent, which amounts to about 2 acres; Kentucky, 4 percent, which is less than 300 acres; Nevada, 50 percent, for the laudable purpose of trying to make it possible for the cotton farmers in that State to have a gin; North Carolina, 8 percent; Tennessee, 3 percent; Virginia, 22 percent; and a whole group of States, including Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, would receive approximately a 2-percent increase.

How did it work out? The great State of Arkansas has its 1955 planting quota allotted on an acreage of 1,529,000; but under the action of the committee, Arkansas would receive 3,300 acres, to take care of small farms.

But the State of North Carolina, with one-third the cotton acreage of Arkansas—or 515,000 acres—would receive 38,000 acres. What had happened? The State of Arkansas had made its allocation for small farms. Forty-one and eight tenths percent of all the acreage reserved by the State of Arkansas was used for small farms.

Mr. President, how much do you suppose the State of North Carolina used for small farms from its State reserve? It used absolutely nothing—zero; not 1 acre of the State reserve was, in the case of North Carolina, used for small farms.

The State of Arkansas used 41.8 percent of its acreage for small farms. It solved its small-farm problem; and, therefore, when Arkansas comes to consider the committee's proposal, Arkansas finds that, by action of the committee, because Arkansas did what the cotton law of 1949 said she should do, because Arkansas set up a reserve for its small farmers, Arkansas will, under the committee proposal, get 3,000 acres, on a base of 1,500,000 acres, whereas the State of North Carolina will get 38,588 acres on a base of one-third that much, or 515,000 acres.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree entirely with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico as to the inequitable way in which

this program would work against State committees which have made allocations for small farms. If we now give preference to States which did not make their allocations to take care of small farms, will not other cotton producing States next year probably disregard the problem of taking care of the small farms, if they find themselves the victims of having followed the spirit of the law in that regard?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Oklahoma is entirely correct. There will not be a State in the Union which will make a reservation of a single acre for small farms, because the State will have been notified, if this action stands, that the way to get acreage is to gut the small farmer. Then it can come back and say, "Now the small farmer is in distress. We have successfully gutted him. Now we want some acreage to help him out."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ERVIN. Assuming that the Senator from New Mexico is correct in saying that those in charge in my State of North Carolina made an improper allocation, the Senator from New Mexico is now advocating that we compound a wrong by taking away from the farmer who has 4 acres or less the only method he has of making a living and giving it to those who are able to raise cotton by machinery on broad acres. In other words, he says that we should follow the Scriptures and give to him who hath, and take away from him who hath not.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is an interesting question. I do not regard it as much of a question, except that it is in no way a correct interpretation of what I said. It is completely erroneous.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from New Mexico says the Senate should do wrong—

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not.

Mr. ERVIN. From my standpoint. The Senator from New Mexico says we ought not to give to the small cotton farmers as much as 4 acres, or 75 percent, if they farm less than 4 acres.

Mr. ANDERSON. I invite the Senator to read what I have been saying. He will find that I have made no such suggestion. I am merely suggesting to those who brought in the report that if it is all right to do justice to the farmer of North Carolina, it is not exactly a penitentiary offense to do justice to the farmer in Oklahoma or Arkansas.

Mr. ERVIN. I understood the Senator from New Mexico—and he can correct me if I am mistaken—to say that he is opposed to a bill which would enable a farmer in North Carolina—who knows no other way of making a living except growing cotton, as much as 4 acres, or a lesser amount if he has had a lesser allotment.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator can assume what he wishes, but he has not heard me say anything like that.

Mr. ERVIN. Then is the Senator in favor of the bill against which he is speaking? Am I justified in drawing that inference?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think the Senator is justified in making that as-

sumption. I did not oppose the bill which was reported, which was designed to give some relief. I tried to get the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to realize that relief is just as important to a man who is starving on a 20-acre piece of cotton as to a man who is starving on a 3½-acre piece of cotton. The degree to which the starvation takes place does not matter, if it takes place at all.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is probably correct. The agony of the man starving to death on 20 acres or 100 acres would probably be greater than that of the man on 4 acres or less, because it would take him longer to starve to death.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it would be helpful if the Senator were to try to find out what happens when a man makes a large investment in a farm, and borrows money from a bank.

There sits in the Chamber at this moment a very distinguished member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who, not long ago, was discussing the difference in farming in his State at present, as compared with the situation when he was younger. He reminded us that when he started to farm one could obtain a small piece of ground and a team and go to work. However, his sons must have \$10,000 worth of equipment to start. That is why, when we reduce the acreage in each State to a great degree we put that young man in jeopardy, because he owes \$10,000 to a bank. He must make payments on it. It does not soften the blow to any extent to say that he is not a small farmer if he has 160 acres. He has a big problem. I had hoped that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would look at the problem in terms of distress.

Consider the situation in the State of Oklahoma. The State of Oklahoma has a base of 872,000 acres. Under this bill the State of Oklahoma would get the magnificent sum—and I hope the senior Senator from Oklahoma has paid attention—of 1,807 acres, out of 872,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. By comparison, it is interesting to note that the State of Florida has a total cotton allotment of 36,282 acres, which is somewhat less than 5 percent of the cotton acreage to which Oklahoma has been entitled by reason of historical factors. Florida, with less than 5 percent of that acreage, receives in excess of 500 percent more relief under this bill than does the State of Oklahoma. On a base of 872,000 acres, we receive only 1,807 acres. Florida, with a base of 36,282 acres, receives 5,064 acres. If we are to share in the hardship, there is not a cotton farm in the United States which has had to come down in the ratio of 28 million to 18 million, which is the national ratio, which is not in hardship.

I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that, much as we desire to help the 4-acre farmers, those who are having a most difficult time on 40 acres are in just as great jeopardy. Certainly any bill designed to alleviate the hardship should not be written on the theory that

the hardship exists in only a very few of the cotton-producing States.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. It is true that, because of the topography of Oklahoma, and because of the rainfall in certain sections of Oklahoma, a man does not try to farm 3½ acres of cotton, as he might do in North Carolina, which is blessed by providence to a greater extent so far as concerns the character of the soil and the amount of rainfall.

Mr. ERVIN. And the number of children.

Mr. ANDERSON. And the number of children.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The farmer on 35 acres has the same problem. The principle of justice in the bill which was reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry yesterday—with respect to which I say again that I am happy I cast the only vote in opposition—is that we shall give exceptional acreages where the pattern of agriculture is of one type, but we shall give no relief whatever, even though the people are in just as deep distress in another part of the country, if they live in a part of the country where the acreage of farms is a little greater.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the attention of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I hope he will look at the chart which he was holding in his hand a moment ago. If he does, and if he looks at the figures opposite the names of Florida and Oklahoma, he will find that the State of Florida used 60 percent of its total State reserve to aid farmers with small acreages. He will find that in the case of Oklahoma less than 15 percent of the State reserve was used to aid the small farmers. Here are the figures: In the case of the State of Florida the total State reserve was 3,628 acres, of which 1,995 acres were used to alleviate the problems of the small farmer. In the case of Oklahoma the State reserve was 130,880 acres, and the amount of acreage used to alleviate the problems of the small farmers was 17,851.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from New Mexico will do the same thing with reference to the figures of his State, he will find that those who did the apportioning in his State used the 18,219 total State reserve in such a way that only 3,831 acres went to alleviating the condition of the small farmer. It indicates rather clearly that Florida has gone all out in trying to help the small farmer.

Let me say, incidentally, that I had no part in drafting the bill and did not offer a bill; I was not a member of the subcommittee which drafted the bill, but was glad when the subcommittee recognized the fact that the small farmers with 4 acres or less could not be expected to make a living on such a small acreage, and was therefore glad that the subcommittee adopted the approach it did. If the Senator from New Mexico

will look further he will find from the second compilation that all of the 5,064 acres which would be allotted to the State of Florida would go to 4,458 farms. That is a little more than 1 acre for each farm.

While I in no sense question the sincerity of any Senator in this matter, I hope all Senators will realize that what the committee is trying to do is to give relief to the small farmers who are being deprived of the opportunity to meet the obligation to support their families.

If we should undertake to give heavy acreage relief to farmers who are able to buy tractors and who are able to have broad acres, we would not have any bill whatever.

I am sure Senators will realize that we should not approach this question from the standpoint of States, but from the standpoint of attempting to give relief to very poor people. Those poor people do need relief. They have a right to look to Congress to give them that relief.

The Senators from New Mexico and Oklahoma, as I have said, are completely sincere in their approach. I hope they will get away from the idea of arraying one State against another State. What the committee has tried to do is to recognize the abject poverty that exists. For example, in the State of Florida most of the cotton farmers are very poor. Most of them are colored people. They live on a very small parcel of land, and too often they live in shacks which would not be recognized as proper habitations for human beings in some other States. I am sorry that they must live as they do. I am sorry that any Senators see fit to take issue with the effort to give relief where relief is very badly needed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. In answer to the distinguished and able Senator from Florida, I should like to say that in quoting the statistics of Oklahoma as to its allocation to the 4-acre farms, the Senator does not mean, I am sure, to convey the impression to the Senate that our 4-acre farms have not been taken care of. They have been taken care of fully.

He may agree that 4 acres in Florida will produce more lint than 10 acres in Oklahoma. We have thin land. We have drought conditions. We do not have the rich delta land that Florida has. Although Oklahoma used to be the second largest cotton-producing State in the Union, it is a fact that as progressive cuts have been made in cotton acreage cotton production has consistently declined.

We have taken care of the small hardship farmers, but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that there can be hardship on a large farm, too, and that the hardship of one of the larger Oklahoma farmers, can be as great as that of a farmer in the State so ably represented by the Senator from Florida. We are only asking that, based on the allotments the States have earned under the historic plan, all the cotton-producing States shall share and share alike.

If Senators wish to make the allotment 3 percent, as provided in the House bill,

I am in favor of it. If Senators wish to make it 1½ percent, as provided in the Stennis amendment, I am in favor of that. However, I do not like favoritism shown in the allocation of hardship acreage, because hardship exists in every cotton-producing area of the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say a word with reference to what the Senator from Oklahoma has been saying. In his State, out of 48,000 farms, only 3,000 are farms of 5 acres and less. Therefore it would take only a very small number of acres to take care of the situation in Oklahoma. The State of Oklahoma used 13.6 percent of its State reserve to take care of the small farmers, and those small farms were taken care of adequately.

The bill came to Congress in the first instance because some States did not make any reservation for small farms. They allotted all the acreage, and then said, "Distress conditions exist in our States, and we want you to do something about it."

We cannot get away from the fact that the State of Oklahoma has 872,000 acres allotted to it in 1955. The bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry gives it the magnificent total of 1,800 acres, whereas the State of North Carolina, with 515,000 acres, gets 38,000 acres to take care of its problems.

Mr. KERR and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate very much what the Senator from New Mexico is saying. I appreciate also what the Senator from Florida has said.

Speaking now for the junior Senator from Oklahoma and the senior Senator from Oklahoma, I want all Senators to know that in our efforts to bring about a different allocation than that provided for in the bill reported by the committee, we do not have anything against any other State. It so happens that we were elected to represent the State of Oklahoma. I take it that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was elected to represent the State of New Mexico and the farmers of New Mexico. If there is to be a bill providing 169,000 or 170,000 additional acreage for cotton—I believe that is what the bill provides—

Mr. ANDERSON. One hundred and sixty-nine thousand acres.

Mr. KERR. If that is the case, we believe that an allocation of 158 acres to the State of New Mexico and an allocation of 1,807 acres to Oklahoma would hardly be consistent with any conceivable formula for determining how the additional acreage should be distributed.

Mr. ANDERSON. The decision of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was that, to the State of California, even though that State is one of the largest agricultural empires of the country, not one acre would go under the bill.

As to the State of Texas, so ably represented, in part, by the majority leader, about one-tenth of 1 percent would go to Texas under the bill.

Apparently a Senator should not become majority leader or minority leader.

By doing so he gets his throat cut in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is exactly what happened to the two leaders in the Senate.

Florida gets 15 percent; North Carolina gets 8 percent; Virginia gets 22 percent. I merely point out that Arizona has some rights in this matter. It, too, has distress, even though it is not measured by 3 or 4 acres.

In the western part of the great State of Oklahoma, as the able Senator from Oklahoma well knows because he has campaigned throughout the State very thoroughly, in the area around Guymon, a man who has 3 acres of cotton would not be refused an allocation by the State committee; he would be committed to the insane asylum for trying to make a living on such an acreage of land. A cotton farmer in that State must spread out because of drought and other bad conditions, and he must take 100 acres or so, and on those acres he must try to scratch out a living. However, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry said, "Oh, no, you don't; even if your children are in rags, as long as you are not a 4-acre planter, you cannot get any relief under our bill."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not possible that a farmer with 15 acres of thin upland would be in worse shape than a farmer with 5 acres of good bottomland which had ample water?

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, that is true. Distress cannot be measured by acreage.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not true that a relief formula which provides for allocations, regardless of the quality of land or the location of the land, only to those farmers who have been allocated less than 5 acres is a mockery as a general relief measure?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is nothing else but that. That is what I tried to say to the committee. As I said to the Senator from Oklahoma, I was the only one who voted as I did. Perhaps it should be stated that perhaps I was voting to take care of my own State. However, it so happens that I am the only representative on that committee from the entire arid section of the United States, comprising the States of Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and the western part of Texas.

I felt that the people who were in trouble there had a right to get relief such as was given in the State of Mississippi where the State looked at the problem and said, "We will give the acreage to the people who have large farms," and they did not set 1 acre of land aside from the State reserve for the small farms. When they got into trouble, they said, "We have a distress problem because of the big people taking all the acreage. The small farmer is in distress, and, therefore, Congress should give some relief."

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from New Mexico join with me in saying that we have no purpose whatever to give to

those in distress in some States less relief, but to make it possible that whatever relief is provided shall be given on an equitable basis in distress cases in all the cotton-producing States?

Mr. ANDERSON. Precisely. I have been trying to get something of that nature done. I did not wish to disturb what had been worked out carefully by the committee, but I do not think it is right to base it on the size of a farm. The able chairman of the committee asked me what I was objecting to, and I think I made it plain that I was not objecting to the figures in the first column; but State relief can be just as acutely needed for an area where the acreage is greater as for an area where the acreage is smaller. I pointed out that the State of Arkansas had 1,529,000 acres which it had earned, by history, and it got the grand sum of 3,309 acres. But the State of North Carolina, with one-third the acreage, got 38,000 acres. I say it is entirely possible that the farmer in Arkansas needed relief even if his farm was actually greater. The committee might have done a better job.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that the State of South Carolina needs greater acreage to take care of the situation? Is it not true that in some counties in South Carolina, Mississippi, and North Carolina it would have been impossible to have given all the relief required?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not quarrel with the able Senator from South Carolina on that point. His State set aside 46.7 percent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And how much did Arkansas set aside?

Mr. ANDERSON. Arkansas set aside 41.8 percent of its reserve. If the Senator will take the time to look at the statistics he will find that the 41.8 percent in Arkansas came closer to relieving the small farmers than did the 46 percent in South Carolina.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The State of Arkansas undertook to conform to the intent of the law and to protect the small farmer and made its allocation on that basis. It now finds that in a measure which purports to do justice to some small farmers in other States where the State boards failed to set aside sufficient acreage to take care of the small farmers, it is penalized because it tried to do the right and wise thing when it had the opportunity.

Mr. ANDERSON. I could not agree more with the Senator. That is the tragedy of the situation.

Mr. President, I wish to explain why I am concerned about this situation. I wrote a great deal of the Agriculture Act of 1949. My name is on it. It was based upon the experiences I had in the Department of Agriculture when we found we could not control the cotton situation.

We could not shrink the cotton acreage below 27 million acres. So we tried year after year to get someone to pro-

pose an agricultural bill which would bring cotton under control. In the Control Act, which I sponsored as soon as I became a Member of the Senate, we recognized the situation. We recognized the desirability of what the State of Arkansas has done. It set aside enough of its acreage for trend and enough of its acreage for small farms. It did a job to serve the small farmers of that State. When it has done it, we say, "We will now penalize you in comparison with States which have not done that." I think that is wrong.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure my good friend from New Mexico wants to be fair about it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I have said that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Notwithstanding the fact that the State of Arkansas has done all the Senator says it has done, it was 3,309 acres shy in making available to the farmers of that State the minimum provided for in the bill. Take the State of Oklahoma. Oklahoma set aside a sufficient amount to take care of the 4-acre farmer, but it was short some acreage. This bill provides for the deficiency.

If the Senator will look at column 6 and column 7 he will notice—

Mr. ANDERSON. Column 6 and column 7 of what?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of this table, which I thought the Senator had before him. He will notice that the number of acres allotted to each State is in some cases a little bit more than in others, but it does not average more than about 1 acre, because, in order to make it possible for the small farmers who have less than 4 acres or 75 percent of their highest planting in 1952, 1953, and 1954—

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not questioning that. I am pointing out that the State of Arkansas has 6,400 small cotton

farms and it did a pretty good job. The statistics carried in the Senator's hearings break down only to 5 acres and not to 4 acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point I wish to make, and I am sure the Senator will agree with me, is that in Alabama, although Alabama made an effort to take care of the situation about which complaint is made, they were 20,724.7 acres short of being able to take care of all their farmers.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have not questioned that. I have not said they should not try to take care of the farmers in Alabama. I say, if the committee has such a strong desire to take care of distress in Alabama, why does it say it will not take care of distress in Arkansas?

Mr. ELLENDER. We do, on the same basis as in Alabama.

Mr. ANDERSON. I made a motion that there be allocated enough acreage, 3,600 acres, to take care of one distress situation in New Mexico, and approximately 5,000 acres to take care of the Welton-Mohawk situation in Arizona, where the distress is as great as it is in any other State.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago, when I was discussing the matter with the Senator from New Mexico, I referred to a table indicating the number of acres allotted to various farms in the country and the number of farms affected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at the point where the discussion took place.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the chairman of the committee offering the table. I wish that it might be placed in the RECORD at that point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1955 upland cotton allotments: Additional acreage allotments required and number of farms affected in providing minimum farm allotments on basis of specified proposals<sup>1</sup>

| State               | Smaller of 5 acres or largest planted acreage <sup>2</sup> |                | Smaller of 4 acres or largest planted acreage <sup>2</sup> |                | Smaller of 4 acres or 75 percent of largest planted acreage <sup>2</sup> |                |
|---------------------|--|----------------|--|----------------|--|----------------|
|                     | Additional allotments required                             | Farms affected | Additional allotments required                             | Farms affected | Additional allotments required   | Farms affected |
| (1)                 | (2)  | (3)            | (4)  | (5)            | (6)  | (7)            |
| Alabama.....        | Acres 52,284.7   | Number 40,386  | Acres 32,243.4   | Number 27,840  | Acres 20,724.7   | Number 21,930  |
| Arizona.....        | 233.3  | 98             | 152.1  | 82             | 134.5  | 78             |
| Arkansas.....       | 8,465.5  | 6,598          | 5,054.7  | 4,252          | 3,309.7  | 3,041          |
| California.....     | 0  | 0              | 0  | 0              | 0  | 0              |
| Florida.....        | 10,152.4   | 5,975          | 6,886.9  | 4,860          | 5,064.6  | 4,458          |
| Georgia.....        | 41,776.4   | 28,124         | 24,701.6   | 19,594         | 17,799.0   | 16,502         |
| Illinois.....       | 207.6  | 183            | 144.1  | 147            | 75.5   | 83             |
| Kansas.....         | 3.8  | 2              | 2.2  | 1              | 2.2  | 1              |
| Kentucky.....       | 608.0  | 599            | 449.9  | 519            | 298.1  | 427            |
| Louisiana.....      | 20,101.6   | 14,234         | 13,221.2   | 10,354         | 8,860.7  | 8,602          |
| Mississippi.....    | 68,497.4   | 47,164         | 44,410.4   | 36,934         | 28,132.9   | 32,588         |
| Missouri.....       | 3,046.3  | 2,480          | 1,665.0  | 1,492          | 1,062.0  | 1,139          |
| Nevada.....         | 0  | 0              | 0  | 0              | 0  | 0              |
| New Mexico.....     | 292.8  | 149            | 175.8  | 100            | 158.7  | 93             |
| North Carolina..... | 86,023.7   | 59,523         | 61,374.4   | 51,071         | 38,580.2   | 47,470         |
| Oklahoma.....       | 3,526.7  | 1,968          | 1,986.2  | 1,357          | 1,807.5  | 1,293          |
| South Carolina..... | 36,042.5   | 33,072         | 21,262.0   | 20,681         | 12,641.3   | 13,079         |
| Tennessee.....      | 34,806.4   | 27,791         | 22,351.1   | 20,909         | 14,274.7   | 16,712         |
| Texas.....          | 25,971.1   | 18,873         | 15,299.7   | 12,666         | 11,061.5   | 9,967          |
| Virginia.....       | 8,281.1  | 5,882          | 6,464.2  | 5,525          | 4,071.5  | 5,379          |
| United States.....  | 409,322.3  | 293,101        | 257,844.9  | 218,384        | 168,059.3  | 182,847        |

<sup>1</sup> These data subject to further refinement.

<sup>2</sup> Largest planted acreage during 3-year period 1952, 1953, and 1954.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, how many votes did we receive on my relief proposal in the whole Committee on Agriculture and Forestry? One—my own. It seems that distress depends upon where one lives.

The farmers in Arizona, who have just as much distress, including a group of veterans who have gone into the Welton-Mohawk project, as the Senators from Arizona well know, are in just as much trouble making their payments to the bank and trying to live as are some of the persons who are talking about 3-, 4-, and 5-acre farms.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the able Senator from Arizona. Have I misstated the situation as to Arizona?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from New Mexico has stated the situation exactly. I wish to reiterate what the Senator has said, in that he believes, and I agree with him, that the matter of difference in farm economics must be taken into consideration.

In my State of Arizona, a cotton farmer cannot get along with any acreage under 10 acres. So anything under 10 acres in Arizona is a small farm.

I think the Senator from New Mexico will agree with me that while in Arizona only 152 acres are needed to take care of 4-acre farms, we are getting today 134 acres under the committee bill. That is not of great concern to our economy, because in the West and Southwest 10 acres is pretty generally the smallest economically sound farm unit.

I also call attention to what the Senator from New Mexico has related with regard to hardship cases in the Welton-Mohawk area.

In 1947, by the good judgment of Congress, a national reclamation project was started there. Veterans all over the United States were told that if they could go to that area with reasonable credit, amounting to about \$3,000, they could go into the farming business by drawing for land. They were told by the United States Government that they should go there.

They are in the process of developing 74,000 acres of rich soil which now has Colorado River water on it. It has cost the young veterans an average of \$177 an acre merely to develop the land. The only way they can get a cash crop is by growing cotton, which they are now denied.

Does the Senator from Mexico realize that out of 74,000 acres Welton-Mohawk farmers will be able to plant less than 5,000 acres in cotton in the coming year?

Mr. ANDERSON. That means absolute financial suicide. Yet when an amendment was presented to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, couched in the very language the able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] had requested, an amendment in language which he had devised to take care of the specific problem of Arizona, not one member, other than the junior Senator from New Mexico, thought it was reasonable to give relief to Arizona.

Yes, it is said, give 20,000 or 30,000 acres, or give 15,000 acres, but keep it all east of the Mississippi River. I do

not think that is right. There is an entirely different type of agriculture in the West and Southwest.

I hope that my membership on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry helps me to understand that wholly different problems exist in different parts of the country, and that a problem existing in one section must be met just as fully as any other problem.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I appreciate fully the activities of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico on behalf of agriculture, not only in the West, but all over the United States. I believe he realizes, probably better than any other person among the leaders in agriculture, the fact that the agricultural economy of the United States is changing; that cotton is bound to move to the west, and cattle to the east. There are other changes taking place also. But the Senator from New Mexico long ago recognized these facts.

Does the Senator from New Mexico realize that of the 515 new farms in Arizona last year, 350 were in the Yuma County area where we find the Welton-Mohawk project?

In addition to asking the question, I should like to make the statement that those 350 farms are almost entirely hardship cases. Yet they are not 4-acre or 5-acre farms; they are farms of 10, 40, 60, or 160 acres. Those who acquired those farms are losing not merely what they need to make their acres productive, but they are losing their life savings, by not being allowed to plant not 2, 3, or 4 acres, but their allotment is zero acres.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have received some letters which I hope to introduce into the Record that relate to New Mexico farms in the dust bowl area. The Government recognized that they are in sufficient distress to give them feed enough to take care of an area which has been drought-stricken throughout the years. Because they could not plant for three consecutive years, they lost their history. When we asked for relief for them, we got not a vote from the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for them. I say that is wrong.

I want to plead my case by saying that I have tried to recognize distress for a long time. In 1949, when the cotton acreage law was being drafted the able senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] pointed out to me that because of peculiar circumstances in Oklahoma, the cotton acreage allocation provided in the bill would do Oklahoma a great injustice. He pointed out that the agriculture was shifting in parts of the State, and that the area where cotton had been grown no longer had its history. He asked if something could not be done to take care of Oklahoma.

The bill was drawn so as to waive applying the rule strictly. What was done in the case of Oklahoma was a help. We wrote this into the bill:

The average of the planted acreages, including acreage regarded as planted under the provisions of Public Law 12, 79th Con-

gress, in the States for the years 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948, shall constitute the national base.

Then we included this language:

Except that in the case of any State having a 1948 planted cotton acreage of over 1 million acres and less than 50 percent of the 1943 allotment average of acreage planted for the years 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948, shall constitute the base for such State.

How many States could qualify under that definition? One State. Just Oklahoma.

But we recognized then that Oklahoma had a problem, and we tried to meet it.

I say that today problems exist in the Western States of Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. It is not right to treat those States as if they had suddenly dropped out of the Union.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to remind my good friend from Arizona that we realize, of course, the situation in his State. But I say to the Senator from Arizona that even if the veterans had come to Louisiana or Mississippi without cotton acreage, they would be in the same situation as though they went to Arizona, under the present law. They are new farmers. The law would have to be changed entirely in order to take care of the situation of which the Senator complains.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Arizona for a question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In answer to the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, I should like to state that the Welton-Mohawk project was begun in 1947, before allocations were started. The veterans were promised the land on which to grow cotton. They went to the project, expecting to be able to grow cotton.

I believe there is some moral responsibility involved. I realize the problem confronting the Senator from Louisiana in his State, but I have been trying to bring out the same point which the Senator from New Mexico has tried to bring out; that whereas the Senator from Louisiana refers to a problem involving 4-acre or 5-acre farms, the same problem confronting the farmers of Arizona involves the economy of 10-acre farms.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I wish to express appreciation again to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for the work he did for Oklahoma a few years ago. I hope that he will be equally successful in 1955 in his efforts to bring about a more equitable allocation of distress acreage than has been provided by the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was not a member of the subcommittee and had no opportunity to participate in its deliberations; but had I been given an opportunity, I would have tried to make certain that the State of Oklahoma would get the same relief in those areas which lie across the State line from New

Mexico, where I know personally that drought conditions are severe. I would have been glad to receive the testimony of the Senator from Oklahoma as to what was needed in other parts of his State, because I feel certain that the distress is just as prevalent there.

Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD a few letters and telegrams which I have received. I think it is unfortunate that the impression should be left that only the small farmers are in trouble.

I have received a letter from the editor of the Portales Daily News, of Portales, Roosevelt County, N. Mex. In the letter the fine editor, Gordon K. Greaves, whom I have known since he was a boy, makes some appeals for assistance. He pointed out that the cotton allotment was some 17,000 acres. They used to have 40,000 acres in cotton. But there had been a drought, which made it difficult for the farmers to plant.

The local committees were in real trouble. They asked the Secretary of Agriculture if he might recognize the drought as an abnormal condition.

So I offered an amendment which, as I have said, did not receive much consideration yesterday. I thought there was a possibility that a drought threat, when the Federal Government has year after year proclaimed land as in a drought area, might be considered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the editor of the Portales Daily News be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PORTALES DAILY NEWS,

Portales, N. Mex., November 18, 1954.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I suspect that you had an idea we would be needing some help in our 1955 cotton allotments, when you last talked to me. We only found out this past week that we are up against another problem.

I understand that each county's acreage allotment is based on their acreage for the years 1948, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953. The application of this formula to Roosevelt County has resulted in our obtaining a total acreage for 1955 of 17,644, after all the extra allowances for which our county is entitled have been included. This is a reduction from our 1954 allowable acreage of 10,468, or about 37 percent. The local ASC office reports that only around 22,000 acres were actually seeded to cotton this year, and slightly more than 17,000 were standing at the time the cotton was measured. This sharp decrease, of course, was due entirely to the drought.

Acreages for individual farmers are computed on the basis of the average of the acreages for 1953, 53 and 54, and the factor is 47.7 percent. In other words, a farmer who had 100 acres for each of these years, would be entitled to 47.7 acres for 1955. And the way the program works out, if he was unable to plant for 1 or 2 of those years, he would be allowed only 47.7 percent of the total for the 3 years, divided by three. You can readily understand what this has done to a cotton grower like Mr. Killian at Causey, who had a 500-acre allotment on his dryland farm this year, but was unable to plant because of drought. Actually, his acreage for 1955 will be around 79 acres because he has been able to plant cotton in only 1 of the 3 specified years. There are a number

of dryland farmers who have been unable to plant cotton in any of the past 3 years, and therefore they are out of the picture entirely, except for what nominal acreage they might be able to obtain as a new grower.

I believe Roosevelt County is the only one in New Mexico where this problem exists, because it is due entirely to the dual nature of our farming. We have only around 40,000 under irrigation, and well over 200,000 in so-called dryland cultivation. The failure of our dryland farmers to plant their allotments reduces our base acreage, and is reflected back to our irrigated farmers.

Our county ASC committee explains that although the law permits them to give a farmer credit for acreage he did not plant due to abnormal weather conditions, that it would not have been fair to our irrigation farmers to have done this, because, since the county's total acreage would not have been increased by this practice, they simply would have divided the inadequate acreage among more farmers.

I met with a group of 20 of these farmers last night, and with the county ASC committee, and it was agreed that the county committee would make every effort to gain some relief and extra acreage from the State. However, we recognized this isn't likely to be very helpful for the reason the State committee has already allocated all the acreage to which the State is entitled.

We have hashed this problem over at length, and have tried to come up with some simple formula, similar to the "60-40-40" formula that helped so much last year. Some farmers think that the answer would be to allow them to use the best 3 out of 5 years to arrive at their base, but I am fairly sure that this would raise the Nation's cotton acreage unduly on a national scale, and would defeat the very purpose of the curtailment in acreage.

One suggestion, made by Morton Gragg, who you will remember as one of the group which met with you last winter, seems to me to have possibilities. He believes that if it were possible to provide that no farmer's acreage would be reduced by more than 20 percent of his 1954 allotment, that our problem would be solved. This has the merit of at once taking care of our "abnormal weather" angle, and at the same time limiting our acreage below the national average.

The trouble is that at the moment none of us know what can be done, through administrative orders by the Secretary of Agriculture, or State authorities, and what would require new legislation. Arthur Jones thinks we should have a copy of the original law to see if we can find a loophole for ourselves.

At any rate, I am taking the liberty of telling you of our problem, and will appreciate any advice you can offer.

I am enclosing clippings of recent stories bearing on the point.

Sincerely,

GORDON K. GREAVES.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that three articles dealing with the cotton-acreage bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTONGROWERS HERE FACE 50 PERCENT ACREAGE CUT—ONE-THIRD OF STATE'S TOTAL TRIMMED HERE

Roosevelt County's 1955 cotton-acreage allotment has been reduced by 10,468 acres, or 37 percent under the allotment for this year, while the State's total acreage has been reduced by only 35,748 acres, and only 15 percent, figures from the county ASC office showed today.

The county's acreage allotment was revealed by the county ASC committee yesterday. The total cotton acreage which may be

planted in Roosevelt County for 1955 is 17,644. For the current season, the county's total acreage allotment was 28,217, but drought conditions trimmed the amount actually harvested to less than 17,000 acres.

Elward Combs, the county ASC office manager, said today that individual acreage allotments for the 842 farms with a cotton history in the county are being computed now in the local office. He said that the regulations required that the acreage for these individual farms for the past 3 years be used as a base period. The allotment will be 47.7 percent of that 3-year average.

This method of computation, as well as the sharp reduction in the county's total acreage, are expected to be protested vigorously by local cottongrowers and their friends.

These cotton growers point out that again the Department of Agriculture has failed to take into account the abnormal weather conditions, which has resulted in a negligible amount of dryland cotton being grown during the past 3 years.

Combs said today that any farmer who has failed to plant cotton during any of the past 3 years, would not be eligible to share in the county's acreage quota this year, but he said that a 1,400-acre reserve has been set up to take care of these farmers on the basis of new growers.

Combs reported that for this season, only 22,671 acres were planted to cotton, and only 17,731 acres were still standing when the crop was officially measured. This acreage was further reduced by dry weather during the growing season, but no accurate estimate is yet available of the total harvested acreage.

Combs also explained that the county's cotton acreage history for the past 5 years, excluding 1949, was used as the base on which the county's total acreage was arrived at. He pointed out that the use of these years for the base is required by the law.

Next year's base acreage, Combs said, was 15,959, and the county received an additional 608 acres for the "adjustment for trend," 75 extra acres for "reserve for small farms" and 1,002 from the State reserve "for hardship and inequities."

The total of all these amounts is 17,644 acres, but Combs explains that the county is required to set aside 1,400 acres as a pool for adjustment of hardship cases leaving 16,244 acres to be distributed among eligible growers.

While the county's acreage allocation for next season probably equals the acreage actually harvested this season, the fact that this acreage must be distributed among all those who have cotton history during any one of the past 3 years will drastically reduce the acreage of individual farmers. Combs estimates that farmers will find their 1955 acreage reduced by about half of what it was this year.

Although it is too early to get the reaction of farmers to this reduction, it appeared today that another effort, of the same sort that was successfully undertaken last year, will be necessary.

At that time, however, the problem was a faulty law, which required a farm's cotton acreage to be based on the total cultivated acreage, regardless of any cotton history. This was remedied only by a special act of Congress, providing alternate methods of computing acreages.

This year, it appears the problem is due to the failure of State authorities to take into consideration the abnormal weather which has resulted in almost no dryland cotton being planted for 3 years.

On December 14 the Nation's cotton farmers will again vote in a referendum to determine whether marketing quotas will be operative for the 1955 crop.

[From the Portales News of December 1, 1954]

COTTONGROWERS PREPARE APPEAL

Around 800 Roosevelt County cotton farmers will receive notice today of their acreage

allotments for 1955, as a committee of growers prepare to carry to the State ASC, and Washington, a plea for credit for cotton history lost due to the drought.

Roosevelt County's total acreage will be reduced by 10,984 acres next season—more than any other county in New Mexico. Most of the reduction is attributed to the county's loss of credit in Department of Agriculture records for farms where no cotton was planted because of the drought.

In an all-day session yesterday, this committee of cottongrowers, headed by Robert Compton, Jr., sought a formula that could be made a part of the Nation's agricultural law, that would prevent growers in any one section from sustaining more than their fair share of the Nation's acreage reduction.

Compton left early today for Albuquerque to attend the State Farm Bureau convention, and hoped to present a resolution on the subject to that group. He also hoped that a meeting could be arranged with the State ASC committee, and possibly with Senator CLINTON ANDERSON.

Those working with Compton on the committee yesterday were I. D. Bigler and Dick Martin, of Floyd; Vernon Watson, of Rogers; Kenneth Victor and Dude Harvey, of Dora; and W. G. Vinzant, the county agent. Several other members of the committee who weren't able to be present yesterday planned to attend the State Farm Bureau meeting and any special meetings that are arranged in Albuquerque.

Out of this meeting yesterday came 2 proposals, 1 as a permanent amendment to the Nation's agricultural law, and the other as a policy change to be applied to the 1955 program.

The proposed amendment: "Resolved, That the percentage decrease in the individual farm cotton allotment cannot exceed the percentage decrease in the State cotton allotment by more than 2 percent in any 1 year in which cotton acreage allotments are in effect."

Compton explained that the purpose of this proposed amendment is to have a permanent buffer written into the law that will prevent undue hardships on any cotton-producing area, and thus avoid the annual necessity for committees to carry appeals to the State and National authorities.

For the immediate relief of cottongrowers this year, the committee drafted a second proposal, which is to be submitted to the State ASC committee, with an appeal that the State group help press for relief through the Department of Agriculture.

Here is the second proposal:

"To give recognition to individual farms for drought in 1952 and 1954, allowing an adjusted 3-year acreage for computing the 1955 base history, this additional acreage being supplied by the Department of Agriculture in addition to the county's computed acreage.

"Further, individual farms which have been severely cut in their acreage allotment should be readjusted so that their 1955 acreage allotment should be equal to 65 percent of the average of their 1952, 1953, 1954 planted acres; or 80 percent of their 1954 allotted acres, whichever is the highest, not to exceed 50 percent of their tillable cropland."

Compton explained the reason for the second proposal is to give relief to farmers whose cotton acreage has been reduced under the present formula.

This formula simply takes into account the planted acreages in 1952, 1953, and 1954, takes the average, and the 1955 allotment is calculated on the basis of 47.7 percent of that average.

Compton explained that simply looking at the county's total acreages for those years gives an inaccurate picture of the problem. In 1952, the records show there were 31,418 acres planted; 36,167.8 in 1953, and 21,893.3

acres in 1954. Compton said that these figures would indicate that a normal acreage had been planted during the 3 years, but he points out that a check of the individual acreages on the farms listing sheets show a wide variation in the planted acreage from farm to farm, and from year to year.

Scores of farmers were not able to plant cotton in 1952 and 1954 because of the lack of moisture at planting time.

Also, Compton explained, unless a farmer planted cotton in at least 1 of the past 3 years, he is not eligible for an acreage allotment for 1955. Many farmers, he said, because of the dry weather did not get to plant in any of these past 3 years, and thus have gone out of the picture as far as acreage history is concerned under present regulations.

"Some way will have to be found to allow these farmers a share of the cotton acreage without penalizing those who did grow cotton during those years," he said.

He pointed out, however, that unless the State gets extra acreage from the national cotton pool to take care of these drought conditions, a mere distribution of the available acreage among all farmers would penalize the irrigated cotton farmer.

This is the reason, he said, that it will be necessary to carry this problem to Washington, so that extra acreage can be allotted to New Mexico to take care of this inequity.

[From the Roswell Record of December 3, 1954]

#### ROOSEVELT COUNTY COTTON MEN SEEK RELIEF FROM ACREAGE CUTS

PORTALES.—Roosevelt County cottongrowers, some of whose acreage for 1955 has been reduced by as much as 50 percent because they lost acreage history during the base period due to dry weather, will seek relief both at the State and national level spokesmen here said today.

Robert Compton, Jr., chairman of a special committee of growers which last year carried a similar fight to Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, and obtained extra acreage through an act of Congress, says two proposals have been drafted to prevent individual cotton farmers from having to accept a larger percentage reduction in their acreage than other areas.

First, he says, they hope to have the Agricultural Act, under which acreage reductions are ordered, amended to protect the farmer against wide variations.

This amendment would provide that a farmer's acreage allowance could not be reduced in any one year by more than 2 percent in excess of the percentage reduction ordered for the State as a whole.

Second, Compton proposes that acreage reductions this year be computed on the basis of 65 percent of the 3-year base average, or 85 percent of the 1954 allotted acreage, whichever is the greater, so long as no more than 50 percent of a farmer's tillable acreage is in cotton.

Roosevelt County's cotton acreage for 1955 has been reduced by nearly 11,000 acres from the 1954 allowance, which is a 35-percent reduction. The State's acreage was reduced by around 37,000 acres, which is around 15 percent. Compton explained that this loss in acreage is due entirely to the failure of Department of Agriculture authorities to take into account acreage lost due to the drought. He said the only practical way to give the farmers of Roosevelt County the acreage they need to be on a par with the rest of the State is for Washington to allot additional acreage for this purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I received a letter from a farmer which reads as follows:

I am enclosing newspaper articles about the cut in our cotton acreage which explains our troubles. It seems to me to be very

unfair that we take a 50-percent acreage cut on cotton.

There is no suggestion that any of the other farmers are taking 50 percent cuts. That is why I say to the Senators from Arizona and Oklahoma they had better vote down the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], so they may have a chance to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. The latter amendment is not perfect, but it is a paragon of loveliness compared to the pending amendment and it would do to the farmers.

The proposal by the committee would give the State of California not 1 acre. I think the Senators from California should vote against the amendment. The proposal would give the State of Arizona about 150 acres. I think the Senators from the State of Arizona had better vote against it. The State of Texas historically has earned nearly 50 percent of all the cotton acreage in this country. Texas did not steal the acreage; it got it honorably, by planting to cotton over a long period of years. Texas has a base of 7,600,000 acres. If there were equity in the bill, Texas would get 114,000 acres. But under the proposal what would it get? Eleven thousand acres. Personally, I do not think Texas needs 114,000 acres to serve its population, but the bill would not give Texas a chance to take care of its trouble wherever trouble exists. Therefore, I think a more equitable allotment should have been made to Texas, as in many other places, so I believe the Senators from Texas had better vote down the amendment now pending and support the Stennis amendment.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the letter dated November 18, 1954:

It was so dry this year we didn't even get to plant our acreage allotment; we certainly shouldn't be penalized for that.

This letter was written November 18, 1954.

In fact out of the last 5 years it has been so dry in this country that us dryland farmers have only been able to raise cotton 2 years. Then it was no bumper crop—and didn't add to the surplus.

We can't make the payments on our place if we can't have some rain and more cotton acreage. We appreciate what you have done for us and hope you will help us dryland farmers out again.

Sincerely,

FRANK GREATHOUSE, JR.

ROGERS, N. MEX.

I think that letter is typical of a whole stream of these letters. They do not all have to be put into the RECORD, but one by one they tell the story of distress.

I hope the Senate will proceed to vote down the pending amendment, and then will adopt the Stennis amendment, and send the bill to conference, in order to see if we can do justice to such States as Arkansas, Oklahoma, Arizona, Texas, and even New Mexico.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all, I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico how proud I am to be able to call him my

friend and to have listened to the argument against the pending amendment, which is shocking and completely unfair.

The Senator has indicated his long and deep interest in the subject of agriculture. He did not mention the splendid record he made when he served in the Cabinet of the President of the United States as Secretary of Agriculture.

I wish to recall to the Senator the testimony which was adduced before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ask him if it is not a fact that the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, a citizen of Alabama, advised the committee to adopt no legislation whatsoever on this problem.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. That is the position of the American Farm Bureau and the position of the Department of Agriculture. So far as I know, it is the position of everyone who has made a study of the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing a record of 47 farms dropped from the 1955 listing sheet.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total of 47 farms were dropped from the 1955 listing sheet. Of these 47 farms, 15 surrendered their 1954 allotment. These farms and the additional 32 farms were omitted from the 1955 listing sheet because they did not have history for 1952-53 or 1954. These farms constituted a loss of 1,400 acres to the county.

#### Illustration from specific farms

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| R. O. Peterson, farm serial No. 55-54: | Acres |
| Total cropland.....                    | 982   |
| Cotton acreage:                        |       |
| 1951.....                              | 600   |
| 1952.....                              | 100   |
| 1953.....                              | 0     |
| 1954.....                              | 0     |
| 1955 allotment:                        |       |
| Factored allotment.....                | 15.9  |
| Adjustment for hardship.....           | 4     |
| 1955 allotment, total.....             | 19.9  |
| John Creek, farm serial No. 7179:      |       |
| Total cropland.....                    | 180   |
| Cotton acreage:                        |       |
| 1951.....                              | 68    |
| 1952.....                              | 65    |
| 1953.....                              | 0     |
| 1954.....                              | 0     |
| 1955 allotment:                        |       |
| Factored allotment.....                | 10.4  |
| Adjustment.....                        | 4.7   |
| 1955 allotment, total.....             | 15.1  |

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I believe I shall not place in the RECORD a summary of the precipitation data, I merely state that it shows one of the problems which confront the farmers.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Roosevelt County Farm Bureau Cotton Committee, of Portales, N. Mex., enclosing a memorandum of agricultural information from Roosevelt County, N. Mex.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK,  
Portales, N. Mex., February 5, 1955.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: We are pleased to enclose in this letter a memo giving agricul-

tural information in regard to Roosevelt County and the cotton allotment granted to this county for 1955.

We feel that if there is a county in the United States that has hardship cases, it is this county, which, as you know, has had a severe drought during the past 3 years, which drought has eliminated the planting of cotton on our dry land farms for either one or more of those 3 years, on which our cotton allotment is based.

We are therefore writing to ask your help in bringing this matter before the Senate Agricultural Committee and especially the subcommittee which we see by the papers has been appointed by Senator ELLENDER to take up with the Department of Agriculture the possibility of increasing the total cotton acreage some 200,000 to 300,000 acres to take care of hardship cases.

We have included in this memo the number of farmers who have allotments of less than 5 acres, which we certainly consider a hardship and an unprofitable acreage; however, it will take only some approximately 300 acres to bring those 140 farmers up to a 5-acre planting.

We certainly will appreciate any help that you can give us. Our income from cotton from the county is one of the greatest sources of income the county has and the continued decrease in acreage, coupled with the drought, is playing havoc with the welfare of this county.

We certainly hope, therefore, that Senator ELLENDER's recommendation will be followed and that you will be able to get the committee to allot a reasonable proportion for New Mexico and to be used in the drought-stricken areas.

Yours very truly,  
Robert Compton, Jr., Chairman; Emil Bigler, H. B. Duncan, John F. Morgan, Jr., Ishmei D. Bigbe, L. C. Morrison, R. O. Peterson, J. T. Laxson, Roosevelt County Farm Bureau Cotton Committee.

#### AGRICULTURAL INFORMATION FROM ROOSEVELT COUNTY, N. MEX.

Roosevelt County has a total of approximately 1,600,000 acres of land, of which some 400,000 acres is in cultivation. The county has 1,700 farmers, of which 840 grow cotton.

The cotton allotment for 1954 for this county was approximately 28,000 acres. For 1955, the allotment is 16,560 plus 1,200 acres additional allotment granted by the State committee for upward trend, making a total allotment of 17,760 acres, or a decrease from last year of approximately 35 percent. The average cotton allotment per grower for the county is 20 acres. Included in that is 145 farms with an allotment of 5 acres or less. The 840 farmers in the county who grow cotton have a total of 142,890 acres in cultivation, which gives an average of about 15 percent of the cultivated acres for growing cotton.

We need at least 5,000 acres additional allotment for Roosevelt County to take care of urgent hardship cases, including a small number of acres to bring the 145 farmers who have an allotment of 5 acres or less, up to 5 acres. The urgent hardship cases are dry land farmers in this drought disaster area, a great majority of whom, during the past 3 years, haven't had sufficient rain either in one or two of the past 3 years to plant cotton at all. So that in figuring the individual farm allotment of cotton for 1955 for this county, which allotment is based on the past 3-year average, when there is no credit given for the drought years when the farmers tried or wanted to plant and couldn't, for 1 or 2 of those years, gives the farmer such a low average that when you take 47 percent, the county factor, of that 3-year average, it cuts the average county farm allotment 35 to 40 percent and

in many cases a great deal larger cut than that. The cut in these allotments for cotton and other crops is making it practically an impossibility for the small farmers to more than pay expenses and therefore not profitable to continue to operate under these conditions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from California had not reminded me, I might have forgotten to mention that the Farm Bureau Federation has been beseeching Congress not to pass the bill now pending.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely should like to say I join with my colleague from California in commending the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who is a former Secretary of Agriculture, for the deep interest he has taken in the subject of agriculture.

I certainly think that any legislation which is enacted should be equitable to all the States which engage in the production of a particular commodity. I believe the amendment reported by the committee is not equitable. I hope it will be defeated. I hope the position being taken by the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Arizona, and other Senators will be supported by the Senate. I certainly take the same position.

I would take the same position if there were pending discriminatory proposed legislation adversely affecting the great States of the South. When the Senate legislates, I believe it ought to legislate, insofar as men can, on a basis which is equitable to the entire Nation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the minority leader for his remarks. Along the line he just took, I should like to say that when the durum wheat amendment was before the Senate, it was my pleasure to support the Senator from North Dakota, because farmers in his State needed help. The adoption of that amendment could have hurt, slightly, the wheat farmers of eastern New Mexico. It might have hurt, slightly, the farmers in the western area of Texas, but if it did hurt them, it could not have hurt them as much as it greatly benefited the farmers of North Dakota. We wish to continue to legislate in that fashion.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I was very much pleased when my distinguished friend from New Mexico and my distinguished friend from Oklahoma admitted that with regard to the pending bill they were representing their constituents. I think it is very interesting to see who their constituents are and who my constituents are. I am frank to admit that I am representing my constituents.

The question occurs, Who are our constituents?

The distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma represents 1,293 small farmers. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico represents 93 small farmers. The distinguished junior Senator from Arizona represents 78 small farmers.

I know that there are more than 78 farms in Arizona. I know there are more than 93 farms in New Mexico. I know there are more than 1,293 farms in Oklahoma.

I should like the Senator to hear whom I represent. I represent 47,475 small farmers who have practically no way to make a living except by farming cotton.

If the Johnston amendment is not accepted, it will mean that many small farmers in my State will not be able to farm. They do not have farms which are irrigated. Although the good Lord ought to look more favorably upon North Carolina than upon any other place on earth, we have suffered from drought for 3 years almost as badly as have the farmers of the States in the irrigated areas of the country. The farmers in my State have no irrigation to supply water when it is needed.

The Johnston amendment is not designed to provide relief for men who are troubled about bank loans. It is designed to furnish relief for men who never have been able to get bank loans, and who will never be able to get bank loans. It is designed to aid men who can earn their own bread in the sweat of their own brows only by farming cotton. Under the bill, if it is passed, most of them will receive 1 acre or less.

Mr. President, this is a relief bill, not a bill to make permanent cotton allotments. It is a relief bill to aid small farmers who do not farm with tractors, and who have 4 acres or less. The purpose of the bill is to give them an opportunity to make a livelihood.

If we have to make a choice between having people unable to meet the interest on their bank loans and letting children go hungry, I think we had better take our stand on the side of alleviating hunger. In the last analysis, that is what the pending proposal is. I do not think we should legislate on the basis of States. My friends who represent so many big farmers, and so few small farmers, continue to talk about States. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States should be concerned with human beings, rather than with property or with States.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it not a fact that if the State committees in any of these States had been concerned with human beings and the 4-acre farmers, they could have utilized their States' acreage, last year, in behalf of such farmers?

Mr. ERVIN. That would not have taken care of the entire situation in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. ANDERSON. But, Mr. President, will not the Senator from North Carolina concede that his State did not devote to the small farmers a single acre of its State reserve?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if the North Carolina officials who made the allotments did wrong, that is all the more

reason why the Senate of the United States should do right, and should write a bill which will compel the allotment of this acreage to those who have been mistreated.

Some say that those persons should continue to be mistreated. However, Mr. President, if North Carolina made wrong allotments, the Senate should have enough fairness to see to it that a correction of that situation is made by means of a law, such as the Johnston amendment, which will compel all the States of the Union to make fair and just allotments to the small farmers.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield at this point?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. If it be true that a State could have taken care of its 4-acre farmers, but did not do so, then obviously the State allocations went to those having more than 4 acres on their farms. Is not that true?

Mr. ERVIN. Not necessarily, because many of the States did not have allotments large enough to take care of all their small farmers, even if they had used all the acreage allocated to them.

Furthermore, the Senator from California is advocating the very thing he complains about. He complains that some of the States did wrong, but now he urges that another wrong be done. Two wrongs will not make one right.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from North Carolina that I have the deepest respect and greatest admiration for him generally, and certainly for the manner in which he represents his State. However, I wish to correct what I believe to be an erroneous impression which may have been created by one statement the Senator from North Carolina made. He indicated that the Senators from Oklahoma were speaking for only 1,293 small farmers. Mr. President, we are speaking for nearly 50,000 farmers.

The distinguished Senator from North Carolina said that in the event a State committee failed to allot sufficient acreage to take care of the small farmers within the State, the Senate would do a second wrong if it also failed to provide sufficient acreage so as to make it possible for the minimum acreage to be allotted to each and every farmer.

Let me remind the Senator from North Carolina that his State received as much of an original allotment, on the basis of its history, as did the State of Oklahoma; and, as a result, North Carolina received an allotment of a far greater number of acres than Oklahoma received. The committee in his State could have set aside sufficient acreage to take care of the minimum farmer, the same as was done in many of the other States.

Mr. President, if it were to become known that a State committee could refuse to set aside, for the purpose of taking care of its small farmers, any of the acreage allotted to the State, and that such failure would be followed by action by the Congress of the United States in then giving the State an additional allotment of acres with which to care for such farmers, it might be

possible that no State would set aside enough of its original allotment to take care of the minimum farmers within the State.

Furthermore, I remind my friend, the Senator from North Carolina, that if the Senate were asked to right a wrong which was done when a State committee failed to allocate sufficient of the State's acreage allotment, in order to take care of its minimum farmers, the Congress would be confronted with the necessity of passing a law to compel each State to set aside enough of the acreage given it, to take care of its small farmers.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President—

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, does the Senator from North Carolina wish to ask a question?

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to ask whether the Senator from Oklahoma recognizes that is, in effect, what the Johnston amendment would do—namely, compel them to do right.

Mr. KERR. No; the intent of the Johnston amendment is to this effect: "We recognize that some of the States did not set aside enough acreage, and we will not compel them to do what is right, but we will mistreat every State which did set aside enough acreage to take care of its small farmers; we will mistreat those States by denying them sufficient acreage, but at the same time we will give additional acreage to States which did not set aside any acreage for that purpose, so that enough acreage will be available to the small farmers of those States—not at the expense of those States, but at the expense of all the cotton farmers of the United States."

Therefore, Mr. President, my colleague and I speak for the nearly 50,000 farmers of Oklahoma whose allotments are what they are today, and are as small as they are today, because a great amount of the initial allotment to the State of Oklahoma was used to do the job for the less than 4-acre farmers in our State—the job which now is sought to be done for the less than 4-acre farmers in the States whose committees did not take care of them.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to say that while I admire and respect any Senator who does what is best for his State, I am aware of the fact that we have an overall duty to do justice by all the States; and that when we face the problem of doing equity and serving justice we fail to solve it when we do that which relieves distress in only about one-fourth of the area, all of which is distressed.

I submit there is just as much distress in Oklahoma, Arkansas, New Mexico, Texas, and the other States concerned in this matter, and which are entitled to be considered by the Senate, as there is in the States which would be taken care of by the Johnston amendment.

So, Mr. President, I join my colleagues who seek to defeat the Johnston amendment; and I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] and myself be shown as joint sponsors of the Stennis amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this time—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida desire to speak at this time? I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do desire to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a great deal of heat has been engendered by the discussion today—perhaps necessarily—but I think we need to give a little patient consideration to the question of just what this bill is supposed to do, and whether it will accomplish the objective.

I reiterate what I have already said in this debate prior to this time, to the effect that I offered no legislation in this field. I did not serve on the subcommittee which reported the bill. I had no thought of serving people in my State differently or better than those in any other State or area are served.

The senior Senator from Florida regards this bill as a relief bill, based upon humanitarian principles. It is not justified on any other basis of approach. He commends strongly the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON] and the other members of the subcommittee for having cleared away all the other attempts to depart from the rather strict provisions of existing law relative to the allotment of acreage—that is, all attempts except those which have to do with giving some relief to farmers who, with less than 4 acres of cotton farm, are now being subjected to conditions under which their existence is imperiled.

That is what the bill does. It does not give any great amount of acreage to anyone. The exhibit already placed in the RECORD shows that the 168,000 acres involved in the Johnston amendment, other than the minor amount of acreage to Nevada and Illinois, which has already been explained, will go to 182,847 different farmers, which means that on the average each of them will receive less than 1 acre to add to the allotment which he has been given.

Obviously, and on the face of it, this is a relief measure. It cannot be regarded as anything else. The senior Senator from Florida thinks it is a great mistake to array State against State, or the problems of much bigger growers, wherever they may be—whether in the West, the South, or anywhere else—against the problems of the pitifully small growers who are the only ones who are affected by the committee amendment.

I invite the attention of every Senator from a cotton-producing State, as well as the Senators from other States, to the fact that in every State which has a larger number of small farmers who would be benefited by the bill, there are also growers having larger acreages who have exactly the same problems as are faced by farmers who have larger acreages in other areas of the Nation.

This is not the type of bill designed to give relief to all farmers. It is a bill under which those who are in pitifully

poor circumstances are singled out for some relief. I do not think the States which happen to have sizable numbers of pitifully poor cotton farmers are to be blamed because the bill happens to apply to those people in their States. Instead, they are to be sympathized with, because, as a matter of fact, it is in the areas where the small farms exist that the problem is most acute. We cannot wish it away.

I desire to reiterate the point just made. In Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and every other State, aside from the irrigated Western States, there are tens of thousands of farmers, in the aggregate, who are not brought into the field of this proposed relief. We do not propose to give them any relief. We would be on unsound ground if we did propose to give them any relief. But I think we are on very sound ground in recognizing the manifest fact that there is a great group of small farmers—and I repeat the figure, 182,847—who have less than 4 acres under the allotment, and who, on the average, will receive less than an acre apiece under the committee proposal.

If that is being unfair to anyone, if that is giving relief where relief is not needed, if that is withholding relief from places where it is needed, then I completely misunderstand the nature of the proposed legislation.

I have seen a great many crocodile tears shed on the floor of the Senate in the time I have been here, but I have never seen quite so many shed as in the discussion of this bill. Senators weep for folks who have 60-acre fields, 80-acre fields, or 160-acre fields, who are able to have diesel plants, great tractors, and so forth, to cultivate their fields. They must have them if they are to cultivate their large farms. Yet Senators seek to place them in the same category with farmers who have less than 4 acres to cultivate, and who must look to the proceeds of that tiny cultivation to meet the needs of their families.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to correct an impression which I think exists in the Senator's mind with respect to what Senators from the irrigated States have been talking about.

We agree that the Senator's State has a problem with its 4-acre farms. It probably should be taken care of, we feel, by the State committees under the State allocations. We are talking about our small farmer. Our small farmer is not a 4-acre farmer. He is a 10-acre farmer. We are not crying about the 60-, 80-, or 160-acre farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator did not hear the able address of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was present during most of it. I did not hear him crying for the large farmer. I heard him crying for the small farmer in the West, who is not a 4-acre farmer, but a 10-acre farmer. The Senator ably brought out that there is a difference

in the economic units. We in the West recognize that. We want justice done to our small farmer, who is not a 4-acre farmer; but is a 10-acre farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are several incorrect premises in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. The first is his feeling that all the States in which there have been shown to be large numbers of small farmers have not done their best for those small farmers. To the contrary, as I read the record, except in two States, which it is not necessary to mention again, the States have made every effort to take care of their small farmers. That certainly was done in my State. There was not enough in the State reserve acreage to begin to take care of the problems of the small farmers.

If the Senator will look at the figures for the State of Alabama, he will see that nearly all the State reserve was dedicated to small farmers, and that notwithstanding that fact, there is great need for additional acreage in order to provide the relief which is sought to be provided by this bill. That is one of the unsound premises which the Senator has evidently entertained.

Another premise which seems to be entertained by various Senators is that there is something regional or sectional involved in this question. The senior Senator from Florida has voted gladly for the reclamation projects of the West. He is glad that relatively large farmers are moving in to develop those areas. They are making contributions to the wealth of the Nation. While this measure was being considered by the committee, the Senator from Florida was working pretty hard on 2 measures which happened to vitally affect the State of California, for which he has a considerable affection, despite the well-known rivalry between the 2 States.

I do not think the Senators from California knew, until they were advised by the Senator from Florida, that at my insistence urging the Department of Agriculture had finally ruled that prunes and dried raisins were declared to be surplus, and allowed them to be traded in under the provisions of Public Law 480. I have no apology to make for having engaged in that effort. I was working for the grapefruit growers of my own State at the same time. My file indicates—whether the Senators from California know it or not—that a great many of the good people in their State feel rather kindly toward the Senator from Florida for having engaged in that enterprise.

During the discussion of this bill, the Senator from Florida has been engaged in a very extensive hearing in which it is being sought to build up the export business generally of the fruitgrowers of the Nation. The Senator from Florida sees on the floor his distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP], who is also engaged in the long hearings on that subject. I believe the distinguished Senator from Kansas would be the first to say that the Senator from Florida has never for a moment forgotten, in the course of those hearings, to mention that one of his particular objectives was to take as much care

as he could through this effort, of the fruit and vegetable producers of the State of California, where the production far exceeds the aggregate production of his own State, so far as the value is concerned.

Therefore, Mr. President, suggestions, particularly when they come from the Senators from California, as they have come, that there is something regional or sectional in this matter, would be irritating but for the fact that the Senator from Florida does not believe they understand what is sought to be done under this bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. The fact is that in all the areas where the small growers are in such critical condition, there are also larger growers, who have their own problems. In most States the larger growers have given gladly of their reserves to the small growers, in an effort to help the small growers. In Florida, about 60 percent of the reserve acreage was assigned directly to them, and the rest of it was used to take care of inequities. The Senator from Florida is pleased to note that it has gone to the small growers, and he recognizes the effort of the large growers to take care of the problems of those who cannot take care of themselves.

Mr. President, we believe we are not in the category of fighting for something exclusively for ourselves and our own people. Certainly the Senator from Florida does not want to be placed in that category. The total number of poor cotton farmers in his State aggregates 4,458, out of a total of 182,847 who are involved. We will be able to get by somehow. But I would not feel I were doing the right thing if I stood on the floor of the Senate and supported a measure which did not take care of those small farmers.

With reference to the amendment which will come up after the pending amendment is disposed of, although it was not so designed, and even though the Senators who have offered it say it will take care of the situation, in my opinion, instead of giving about an acre to each of the small farmers in my State, it will give about one-eighth of an acre or less to each of the small farmers in my State. It will give that small amount to the poor farmers of my State who are in such pitiful circumstances.

It is a fact that the proposed amendment does not take care of the situation.

The sole objective of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been to take care of the pitifully small operations, which in nearly every case are carried on by families whose ability to continue to exist, even on the low standard of living which now prevails, is being terribly shaken by the administration of the legislation which has been passed, in the wisdom of Congress, for the benefit of a great and important industry which does need Government regulation and assistance.

At this time I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who, as Secretary of Agriculture and as a great Senator, has fearlessly

tried to have enacted legislation which would cut down overproduction and bring about some degree of balance and some degree of prosperity, on a continuing basis, for the cotton farmers of this Nation.

The Senator from Florida has been a party to that effort and a member of the subcommittee that brought out the Anderson bill, which in part reflects his thinking. He has been a party to the doctrine which was embodied in the bill Congress passed last year and which is now the Federal law on this subject. He does not yield even to his distinguished friend from New Mexico in his desire to bring order out of chaos in the field of agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not want the record to stand without admitting that the Senator from Florida has been very effective in all his work on agricultural legislation. It has been my great privilege to stand beside him in that effort.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Perhaps we are beginning to get together and get back to normality, where we can consider this question as it is.

The pending bill seeks to give relief where relief is very badly needed. We know full well that if we should undertake in the bill to provide much larger acreage figures—and I wish we could write some of the larger figures into the bill—we would be doomed to disappointment in having the measure become law.

Cotton is already being planted in my State. Whatever we do here will be inadequate, I fear, to accomplish very much good there. I hope it will be something which will place first the problem of the small farmer who has less than 4 acres in his cotton farm.

I do not believe we need apologize to each other or to the public or to anyone else in singling out for direct relief, just as we do in other measures in various other fields, that class of cotton growers who, above all others, require some little help at the hands of Congress. There is no other place for them to turn.

I concur entirely with the position taken by my esteemed friend from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] that the mere fact that in two States the control committees did not handle the State reserve to the best interests of solving this question should not relieve the Senate from the responsibility of doing its job now. It happens that in my State the committee did serve well and did its job well. There was simply not enough acreage to take care of the small growers.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, there is no need for additional cotton production. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. None at all.

Mr. GORE. Then the only justification for this proposed legislation is to correct or to ameliorate or to mitigate hardship conditions. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is right. He is saying in a few words what I have been saying at some length. There is no justification for any increase in the acreage, except to bring relief to that segment of the industry that needs it most.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Am I correct in understanding that this bill does not intend at all to prejudice the production history of any of the States insofar as future legislation is concerned?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The additional little bit of acreage which is given—and it is only a pittance—is on a 1-year basis, with the specific provision that it shall not add to the basis of apportionment or allotment in the future.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I assume the Senator knows that in a State like Louisiana large farmers would not benefit, and it would be only the small farmers who could receive the benefit from such legislation as this.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. Insofar as the State of Louisiana is concerned, it is not one of those States which have not tried to take care of its own problems. The figures show that it has tried to do so.

It has not been able to do so. In spite of all it has done, there are still 8,602 small farmers in the State of Louisiana who under this measure would receive the grand total of 8,860.7 acres, or a small fraction more than 1 acre each, in an effort to try to build them up to 4 acres. Some would get less, but they would receive an average of 1 acre apiece in the effort of Congress to bring some relief to the pitiful situation which exists under present circumstances.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the large farmers of a State like Louisiana would not be able to benefit from the legislation, would it not be difficult to explain to our large farmers why we undertook to give more acreage to large farmers in other States in a bill which is designed to take care of the small farmer?

Mr. HOLLAND. It would be difficult. In many States where there are a great many small farmers there are also large farmers, and those large farmers would not get anything under this bill, although they would like to get something.

The Senator's file, no doubt, is full of letters from people who complain that their acreage has been cut down from 120 to 70 acres or less, or something of that sort, and they would like to get relief, too. For us to give relief to farmers in that classification in other States and withhold it from our own farmers would be obviously wrong.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that the amendment which I had previously offered, I now withdraw, and submit it as a modification of the committee substitute, which has been approved and authorized by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question therefore is on agreeing to the Stennis amendment to the committee substitute as modified.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is somewhat difficult for some of us to follow the recommended legislation regarding cotton. The House of Representatives, on the theory that it was doing equity and justice and alleviating hardship, passed a bill which provided for an increase of 3 percent in the 1954 allotment for each State in the Cotton Belt. The Senate committee saw fit to report to the Senate several days ago a new and different measure under which some 168,000 acres would be allocated or apportioned to the several States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if my colleague will yield at this time, because I must temporarily leave the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand the yeas and nays have not been ordered on the committee amendment, and I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered on the Johnston amendment because he submitted it as a modification of the committee amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Chair say that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Stennis amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Stennis amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is going to be accepted without a yeas-and-nays vote? The committee reported a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; and the committee voted to modify it by the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], which, therefore, makes the question on the Stennis amendment to the committee amendment as modified by the amendment originally offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then the vote will be on the Stennis amendment as modified, which is, in effect, a committee amendment as reported by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Chair will say that the vote will be on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi to the committee amendment as modified by the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina; and the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then, the vote will come first on the Stennis amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands. The Chair will state that the vote will be on the amendment to the committee amendment, as modified.

Mr. ANDERSON. As modified?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have the right to determine what is a perfecting amendment, or may a Senator have the right to raise a question as to whether or not it is a perfecting amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the committee has a right to modify its amendment until the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Were not the yeas and nays ordered on the Stennis amendment prior to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not on the committee substitute, the Chair will state.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope the Chair will listen to the question of the Senator from California. He asked, "Were the yeas and nays not ordered on the Stennis amendment before the Johnston amendment?" The answer, of course, is "Yes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But that was on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi, and not on the committee substitute. It would not have any effect on the statement made by the Chair. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think the situation at this time is as follows—

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina was propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the situation in which we find ourselves is that the committee offers a modification, which it has a right to do. Then any Senator on the floor has a right to move to amend. That is my understanding of the situation at the present time. The Senator from Mississippi has an amendment pending, which amends the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to offer a perfecting amendment. I do not wish to lose the right to make the motion with respect to my amendment. When can I make it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that it is in order at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Stennis amendment. My amendment is to perfect the Stennis amendment, and I wish to have it voted on at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the amendment of Mr. STENNIS, it is proposed to insert the following:

In addition to cotton-acreage allotments provided by this legislation and previous Cotton Acreage Acts, the 1955 cotton-acreage allotment heretofore established for Illinois and Nevada, pursuant to the provisions of subsections (b) and (k) of this section shall be increased to 3,500 acres, and the additional acreage so allotted to the State shall be apportioned to farms in the manner provided for above in this section: *Provided*, That in the case of Arizona, the additional acreage allotted to the State shall be apportioned so as to provide each farm for which a 1955 cotton-acreage allotment has been established, as well as each farm which is eligible for a 1955 new-farm allotment, a minimum allotment equal to 10 acres. If the additional acreage allotted to the State is insufficient to meet the total of the farm increases so computed, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the State: *Provided further*, That in the case of New Mexico, the additional acreage allotted to the State shall be apportioned primarily to farms which the State committee determines are hardship cases, due to reduced cotton production caused by adverse weather conditions in 1952, 1953, or 1954, so as to provide fair and reasonable allotments for such farms.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered does not add a single acre to the allotment which would be received by Arizona or New Mexico under the Stennis amendment; the acreage remains exactly the same.

However, the amendment provides that when acreage is allotted to Arizona, that State shall provide for its distribution in a manner satisfactory to the people of Arizona; and in the case of New Mexico its acreage can be disposed of in a manner that suits the people of that State. That is all the amendment does with respect to Arizona and New Mexico.

The amendment also adds 440 acres for Illinois and 1,176 acres for Nevada. In the case of Nevada the principal reason for the addition is to provide sufficient acreage to enable the use of a cotton gin in that State.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have been informed by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that there is no objection to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona and that it can be agreed to. If that be the fact, I ask unanimous consent that the vote may be taken on the amendment without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], for himself and other Senators.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the form in which the Senate committee originally reported the cotton bill, about

168,000 acres were allocated to the States of the Cotton Belt, so that the 1955 allotment in those States would be increased for the benefit of small, 4-acre farms.

In addition, one-half percent of the 1955 allotment was given to each State in the Cotton Belt.

By the amendment which was agreed to by the committee last night, the one-half percent of the present allotment to each State was eliminated. That is the effect of the perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

I wish to refer very briefly to the testimony of the President of the American Farm Bureau, a constituent of the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who now occupies the Chair. He stated before a Senate subcommittee that it had been the consistent position of the American Farm Bureau that the law should contain a mandatory provision that the small farmer be taken care of. No consideration favorable to that recommendation by Mr. Randolph was given by any committee of Congress or by the Congress, and no provision of that kind was written into the law. So each State, with respect to its 1955 allotment, had a right to make its allotment in any fashion it desired.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has graphically stated that some States first made their allocations in favor of the small-acreage farmer, while other States did not.

The State of the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama devoted a great amount of its 1955 allotment to the alleviation of the situation of the small, 4-acre farmers.

So I think it can be said that the proposed legislation now being considered on the floor would be exceedingly unfair if it were grounded on the theory that States that have done what justice and common decency dictate should be penalized, and that an additional allocation, provided by emergency legislation, should be given only to those States which did not follow equity and justice in their allocation and distribution of the acreage.

For those reasons, and because I do not wish to take more of the time of the Senate, I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], which gives California zero acres, will be rejected when the vote is taken on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sure all Senators realize the importance of the cotton crop to the agricultural economy, and to the general economy of the Nation, as well. We all realize, too, the plight of a considerable number of the

small farmers in a few States who, without appropriate legislative action, will be unable to plant enough cotton to make a decent crop this year. It was in recognition of this situation that I agreed to the reporting of the pending bill by the committee, reserving the right to oppose any amendments, or the bill itself.

Mr. President, I believe we should consider briefly what the cotton situation is. We know what happened in the case of potatoes, when we induced the production of huge quantities of potatoes which the market would not take, which the consumer would not eat. There are now on hand hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat, of low-milling quality, because we have encouraged the production of that grade of wheat.

There is also a large quantity of cotton on hand, a good deal of it of such quality that the buyers do not dare to buy cotton far into the future for fear that some low-grade material will be delivered to them. The effect has been to lower the price not only in the United States, but to hurt the situation in the foreign market for cotton.

As I have said, Mr. President, I believe there are 180,000 small farmers who, under the present law, as it has been applied in the different States, will be unable to plant even 4 acres of cotton on each farm. I am sorry to say that some States apparently allocated their cotton acreage without regard to bringing the small farmers up to the 4-acre minimum, and now they find themselves short of acreage for the current crop. They have come to Congress to ask for the allotment of a sufficient number of acres to bring the small farms up to the acreage which they should have been given in the first place.

Mr. President, I am sorry the situation is such, but we must realize that if this year a State concludes to proceed contrary to the regulations and the intent of Congress, and if then it can come back to Congress and say, "We want acres enough to take care of the situation as it should have been handled in the first place," and we grant that request, next year there will not be any reason for any State allocating the acreage as intended by the Congress.

The bill before the Senate would increase the cotton production of the country, not largely, but at the same time it would increase the yield the coming year somewhat.

If the market is not good, if we do not recover the foreign markets which our program has in effect, turned over to foreign countries, if the mills continue to convert synthetic fiber into cloth, then we are likely to have controls over the cotton crop for years to come.

We must recognize the situation as it is. I had hoped a fair bill could be worked out between the time of action by the committee and the passage of the bill by the Senate. I had hoped against hope, apparently, that that could be done. I have come to the conclusion that we are not going to get a fair bill, regardless of what amendments may be agreed to.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have decided to vote against all the amendments and against the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope that Senators who are now on the floor will pay attention to the one point I am going to make in concluding.

I thought the pending amendment was a bad one from every point of view before it had been amended, but it has now been amended, by vote of the Senate, under the sponsorship of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], to include in it a provision which I think will be wholly intolerable to any Senator who represents a State in which cotton is produced on dry farms. I read the provision to which I refer:

*Provided, That in the case of Arizona, the additional acreage allotted to the State shall be apportioned so as to provide each farm for which the 1955 cotton-acreage allotment has been established, as well as each farm which is eligible for a 1955 new farm allotment, a minimum allotment equal to 10 acres.*

Mr. President, every Senator on the floor of the Senate who knows anything about cotton production knows that the reclaimed areas in the West produce 2, or even 3 bales to the acre. They know that a 10-acre minimum allotment means a license to produce about 30 bales of cotton as the minimum to be given under this provision, in 1 of our States.

Mr. President, those of us who represent thousands of small farmers from dry-land-farm States know that what we are working for is to build up to 4 acres or less the acreage of 182,847 farmers whose acreage is under 4 acres. We produce something like half a bale of cotton to the acre.

Mr. President, will it be said that the Senate gets into the field of relief legislation in such a way that it appears with 1 hand to grant relief to over 180,000 pitifully poor farmers who are hoping to get 4 acres, or near that, out of this very simple proposed legislation, whereas in another part of the Nation, by the very terms of the bill itself, we fix 10 acres as the minimum number of acres for farmers who are producing on reclaimed acreage, made available to them by Federal appropriation, acreage which produces in the neighborhood of 6 times the amount of cotton an acre? Such a proposal is so absurd that it seems to me it does not need to be stated other than in the few words I have mentioned it.

I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment, as amended, and will proceed to pass the committee bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator from Florida did not make clear that no farmer in my State who has been growing cotton can get any acreage, and that the amendment would apply only to new land which is now being brought under cultivation.

Under the circumstances, I say that veterans and others who have taken up the new land, and have been put to the expense of clearing it, ought to be able to raise cash crops. Cotton is the only crop they will be able to grow. Those farmers cannot grow wheat, barley, or vegetables,

because there are no nutrients or nitrogen in the soil; but cotton can be grown on that land. When a person has made a heavy investment in the land, any action taken that will enable him to make a profit on 10 acres will do him more good than will any other aid.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the comment the distinguished Senator from Arizona has made. However, if he will reread his amendment to the Stennis amendment, I think he will find that it applies not only to new farms, but also to all farms that are entitled to acreage allotments.

I read again from the amendment:

*Provided, That in the case of Arizona, the additional acreage allotted to the State shall be apportioned so as to permit each farm for which a 1955 cotton acreage allotment has been established, as well as each farm which is eligible for a 1955 new farm allotment, a minimum allotment equal to 10 acres.*

I do not see how it could be more clearly stated.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is perfectly clear to me that there are not more than 305 new farms in Arizona. In order to comply with the law, Arizona was given a minimum allotment. That is all there is to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the Senator from Arizona is not arguing, is he, that he does not propose to have a minimum allotment of 10 acres of reclaimed land set up for the number of farms he mentioned, or whatever other number is covered by the cottongrower group in his State?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are 305 new cotton farms in Arizona since 1954, and that is all the provision could apply to.

As the bill was passed by the House, under the allotment provided, 236 acres could be applied to 4-acre farms. To that extent, if a farmer in Arizona had a 4-acre farm, he could get 10 acres.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Florida agrees, does he not, that the so-called 4-acre amendment will not increase the acreage allowed to Arizona; its allotment will continue to be the same. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree that the acreage provided for by the so-called Stennis amendment, which calls for 1½ percent, will not be increased by the Hayden amendment; but the amount of acreage going to Arizona will be materially increased by the Stennis amendment.

Furthermore, the Stennis amendment provides for a situation under which each of the 4,458 small growers in Florida who need some acreage if they are even to approach the 4-acre figure, would receive less than one-eighth of an acre each, as compared to a little more than 1 acre each which they would receive under the committee amendment. Mr. President, we are talking about pitifully poor people; and it makes a great deal of difference to them whether they receive one-eighth of an acre less, instead of a full acre, as an addition to their poor plant.

Mr. STENNIS. But in the case of Arizona, only 4,000 acres are involved under the proposed amendment for Arizona; and the Hayden amendment will not increase that acreage, but merely will permit Arizona to use the acreage in any way it sees fit. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that under the so-called Stennis amendment, on the basis of 1½ percent, the Arizona increased allocation would be 4,500 acres, whereas under the other amendment, namely, the committee amendment, I understand that the figure for Arizona would be much less than that.

Mr. STENNIS. That is true.

Mr. HOLLAND. In fact, it would be 134.5 acres. So the Stennis amendment does very greatly and very liberally increase the acreage for the State of Arizona, which, in turn, by means of the so-called Hayden amendment, would proceed to fix a minimum allotment of 10 acres per farm in the State of Arizona.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is not the pending question on agreeing to the Stennis amendment? Will the vote be taken on the Stennis amendment, as modified by the Hayden amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I shall occupy only about 3 minutes. The pending cotton acreage allotment bill is of great concern to the small cotton farmer.

The committee bill was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, composed of both Democrats and Republicans, and was reported unanimously, with one exception—I believe the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The bill would give the small farmer 4 acres, or a minimum of 75 percent of the past 3 years' allotments of cotton acreage.

A great many small cotton farmers are going to hold on to their farms, which they have rented, regardless of how much their acreage is cut, or regardless of the size of the allotment they have. They are a part of those farms. They have been born and raised in their respective communities. I hope the Senate will vote to help the small farmers.

I know of no man for whom I have a higher respect than I have for the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. However, the Stennis amendment provides for a general increase of 1½ percent overall. I do not believe the administration or the Agri-

culture Department would favor such an amendment. Under the circumstances, I do not believe it is a wise amendment.

The purpose of the bill, as I apprehend it, is not to provide a general increase in cotton allotments, but to alleviate the suffering of the small farmers who are living on farms of four acres or less.

I hope the Senate will approve the committee amendment and reject the Stennis amendment, and thus help the small farmers of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have no intention of detaining the Senate, except to say that cotton legislation, if it is to last, must be framed on a basis of fairness. This is not a fair bill, when it cuts out entirely the great State of California, the State of Arizona, and the State of New Mexico; when it cuts Texas far below its requirements, and when it chops at Oklahoma and Arkansas, although the State committee in Arkansas did a good job.

I believe that cotton legislation will serve its purpose only when it is based upon a decent consideration. That is why I shall support the Stennis amendment. I think a good job has been done in considering this question. I think the committee worked pretty hard, but we are now in a situation in which I think the Stennis amendment should be adopted, if cotton legislation is to stand where it should stand. I intend to vote for the Stennis amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as amended, offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], for himself and other Senators to the committee amendment as modified, beginning on page 3, line 10.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is detained on official business, and, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 39, as follows:

| YEAS—51  |               |               |
|----------|---------------|---------------|
| Anderson | Case, N. J.   | Goldwater     |
| Barrett  | Case, S. Dak. | Hayden        |
| Beall    | Cotton        | Hennings      |
| Bender   | Curtis        | Hickenlooper  |
| Bible    | Daniel        | Hruska        |
| Bricker  | Dirksen       | Jackson       |
| Bridges  | Duff          | Jenner        |
| Butler   | Frear         | Johnson, Tex. |
| Capehart | Fulbright     | Kerr          |

|              |             |              |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Knowland     | McClellan   | Smith, Maine |
| Kuchel       | Millikin    | Smith, N. J. |
| Lehman       | Monroney    | Stennis      |
| Magnuson     | Morse       | Symington    |
| Malone       | Neely       | Thye         |
| Martin, Iowa | Payne       | Watkins      |
| Martin, Pa.  | Purtell     | Welker       |
| McCarthy     | Saltonstall | Wiley        |

## NAYS—39

|          |                 |           |
|----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Aiken    | George          | Mundt     |
| Allott   | Gore            | Neuberger |
| Barkley  | Green           | O'Mahoney |
| Bennett  | Hill            | Potter    |
| Bush     | Holland         | Robertson |
| Byrd     | Humphrey        | Schoeppel |
| Carlson  | Ives            | Scott     |
| Clements | Johnston, S. C. | Smathers  |
| Douglas  | Kefauver        | Sparkman  |
| Dworshak | Langer          | Thurmond  |
| Eastland | Long            | Young     |
| Ellender | Mansfield       | Williams  |
| Ervin    | McNamara        |           |

## NOT VOTING—6

|          |         |         |
|----------|---------|---------|
| Chavez   | Kennedy | Murray  |
| Flanders | Kilgore | Russell |

So the Stennis amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Am I correct in understanding that the question now is on agreeing to committee amendment as amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] I offer an amendment which I desire to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law the 1955 wheat acreage allotment established for each State pursuant to the provisions of this section (excluding those States which received a minimum allotment under subsection (k)) shall be increased by 1½ percent. The additional acreage made available to the States under the provisions of this subsection shall be used to increase each farm allotment to the smaller of (A) 30 acres, or (B) 75 percent of the highest number of acres planted to wheat on the farm in 1952, 1953, or 1954. If the additional acreage is insufficient to meet the total of the farm increases so computed, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the State. If the additional acreage available to the State is in excess of the total of the farm increases so computed, the acreage remaining after making such farm increases shall be added to the State acreage reserve under subsection (e) of this section to be used by the State committee for any of the purposes specified therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in making his presentation of the amendment, but my parliamentary inquiry is—

and I make it because I have had some requests for information—would it be possible now to have an understanding that the yeas and nays are ordered on the final passage of the bill itself, without foreclosing amendments being offered such as the amendment now offered by the Senator from South Dakota, so that we can have that point definitely established?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any Member of the Senate has the right to ask for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And that would not foreclose the Senator from South Dakota in presenting his amendment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Or in asking for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Or in asking for the yeas and nays on the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment which I have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Chair count again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has offered an amendment and is requesting the yeas and nays on his amendment. Let there be a show of hands as to the sufficiency of a second. [After a pause.] There is a sufficient second, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield, if I shall not thereby lose my right to the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, is the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota germane to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the rule of germaneness does not apply to this particular type of legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I do not think it will take me more than 2 minutes to state the proposition, and then we can immediately vote on my amendment.

My amendment simply proposes to do for the wheat farmer what it has already been indicated will be done for the cotton farmer; namely, to take care of the small wheat farmer. It covers a minimum of 30 acres, or 75 percent of the wheat production of the farm, or a 1½-percent increase in the State allotment.

Mr. President, a great many young farmers who came back from Korea found that under the acreage cut, which has ranged up to 30 percent in some counties, they simply did not have enough free acres last year to yield them

sufficient income to pay the interest on the loans they had made. Thirty acres in wheat is comparable to 4 acres in cotton. What is good for the small marginal producer of cotton ought to be good and fair for the small marginal producer of wheat.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask for a favorable vote on my amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has used the same language in his amendment as that written into the Stennis amendment, except that he has stricken out the word "cotton" and placed in lieu thereof "wheat" and he has also modified the acreage provision of the Stennis amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Exactly. I took a copy of the Stennis amendment and wrote my amendment from it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the size of the farms to which the Senator's amendment will be applicable?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I used 30 acres, in consultation with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and we thought that would be comparable to 4 acres in cotton. The language is the same with the exception of substituting "wheat" for "cotton" and 30 acres in place of 4 acres.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator estimate the number of acres that would be added to the amount already allocated?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have not had an opportunity to make the computation, but 1½ percent could not amount to very much.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator realizes, does he not, that the acreage allocated to wheat would be 55 million acres in any case.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But that is on a State basis. It may not work out that way.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the amendment have the result of taking acreage away from large farms and giving it to small farms?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would be governed by the language in the Stennis amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The 1½ percent is over and above the present wheat allotment, to each State; is it not?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. President, if there are no further questions, I ask for a vote.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota. I was perfectly willing to go along with the cotton amendment so long as it provided acreage for people who had an earned base. The committee bill applies to farmers who have less than 4 acres. That is a social problem. They needed help badly. But when we amend the bill as it has now been amended I am sure the Department of Agriculture will disapprove it, and it will be vetoed. I do not see how we can go to the extent of providing additional acres to cotton farmers who

have not earned them, and then expect the wheat farmers to go without any additional acres. We have many real hardship cases among wheat farmers. The Senator from South Dakota has pointed out that World War veterans are in bad shape.

If we are going to give help to the larger cotton farmers, I do not see how we can disapprove of giving a little help to relieve the real hardship cases among wheat farmers.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield? Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What effect would this amendment have on the acreage allotment for hard wheat?

Mr. YOUNG. It would add 1½ percent to the national allotment. There are thousands of hardship cases. It would help farmers who produce 30 acres or less. A farmer who produces 30 acres or less is indeed a small farmer.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. There are instances in which a man has a quarter section of land and at the present time can seed only 32 acres.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know of some farmers who have 2,200 acres and seed only approximately 24 acres.

Mr. YOUNG. The South where cotton is produced has 90 percent of parity supports for rice, peanuts, tobacco, cotton, and naval stores—resin and turpentine. The Republican farming area of this Nation—the Midwest and Northwest—has not one crop which is afforded 90 percent supports under the Benson plan.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the pending amendment. Should the amendment prevail it is my intention to vote against the bill on final passage.

As I stated in my opening remarks, the bill should be limited to cotton acreage allotments as they affect small farmers. We need no increase in wheat or cotton production and the only justification for any Senator supporting the bill as modified by the committee is to alleviate the plight of over 160,000 small farmers scattered all over the cotton area of our country, particularly the South.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "Yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "Nay."

I also announce that on this vote the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], if present and voting, would vote "Yea."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 43, as follows:

## YEAS—47

|               |               |             |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| Allott        | Hennings      | Monroney    |
| Anderson      | Hruska        | Morse       |
| Barrett       | Humphrey      | Mundt       |
| Bender        | Jackson       | Neely       |
| Bible         | Jenner        | O'Mahoney   |
| Bricker       | Johnson, Tex. | Saltonstall |
| Capehart      | Kerr          | Scott       |
| Carlson       | Langer        | Sparkman    |
| Case, S. Dak. | Lehman        | Stennis     |
| Curtis        | Magnuson      | Symington   |
| Daniel        | Mansfield     | Thurmond    |
| Douglas       | Martin, Pa.   | Thye        |
| Dworshak      | McCarthy      | Welker      |
| Eastland      | McClellan     | Wiley       |
| George        | McNamara      | Young       |
| Hayden        | Millikin      |             |

## NAYS—43

|             |                 |              |
|-------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Alken       | Flanders        | Malone       |
| Barkley     | Frear           | Martin, Iowa |
| Beall       | Fulbright       | Pastore      |
| Bennett     | Goldwater       | Payne        |
| Bridges     | Gore            | Potter       |
| Bush        | Green           | Purtell      |
| Butler      | Hickenlooper    | Robertson    |
| Byrd        | Hill            | Schoeppel    |
| Case, N. J. | Holland         | Smathers     |
| Clements    | Ives            | Smith, Maine |
| Cotton      | Johnston, S. C. | Smith, N. J. |
| Dirksen     | Kefauver        | Watkins      |
| Duff        | Knowland        | Williams     |
| Ellender    | Kuchel          |              |
| Ervin       | Long            |              |

## NOT VOTING—6

|         |         |           |
|---------|---------|-----------|
| Chavez  | Kilgore | Neuberger |
| Kennedy | Murray  | Russell   |

So the amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota for himself and Mr. YOUNG to the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 691) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 877, at Baytown, Tex., and certain tank cars.

## DEATH OF HON. PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to inform the Senate of the death of one of the outstanding citizens of Indiana, former Gov. Paul V. McNutt.

Since his retirement from a long and distinguished career of public service, Mr. McNutt had been a practicing attorney with a clientele which took him to many parts of the world.

It was on one of his frequent trips in connection with his law practice that Mr. McNutt was stricken only a few days ago. He was rushed back to New York where his condition improved for a time but became much worse in the last few days.

Mr. President, Paul V. McNutt was truly a distinguished Hoosier. He was a distinguished lawyer, educator, soldier, political leader, and public administrator.

He served as professor and dean of the Indiana University Law School. He was Indiana State and national commander of the American Legion. He served with distinction as Indiana's Governor, Federal War Manpower Commissioner, Federal Security Administrator, High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, and in many wartime emergency posts to which his Government called him.

Indiana is proud to have been the birthplace of Paul V. McNutt. I am sure that many Members of the Senate knew Paul McNutt, as I did, and that they join with me in expressing to Mrs. McNutt and their daughter our sorrow at his passing.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I have just learned of the passing of former Governor of Indiana, Paul McNutt. Paul McNutt was a distinguished son of Indiana, and with the people of Indiana I mourn the death of one of our ablest citizens.

Paul McNutt was a man of the highest intellect, a man of character and patriotism, who lent his talents to the public service in many fields. It was typical of his American enterprise that he achieved distinction as dean of the school of law of Indiana University, as Governor, as High Commissioner to the Philippines, in war service in the Federal Government, and in the private practice of law. Throughout his life he worked with many private agencies in education, the law, and public welfare.

## PAY INCREASE FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I rise to express my own concern, and that of many thousands of Federal employees who have written to me, about the urgency of providing a realistic pay increase for the men and women who so faithfully serve our Government.

I believe there can be no effective argument against the proposition that these fine citizens—postal workers, civil-service employees generally, and other Government workers—have a long overdue increase coming to them to keep their incomes in line with the cost of living.

President Eisenhower has recognized the necessity of such an increase. Postmaster General Summerfield likewise has recommended that the pay schedules of postal workers be readjusted upward. I know of nobody in the administration who disputes the fact that the Government owes a pay raise to its workers.

Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives have recognized the need. I was impressed, for instance, with the statement in the report of our own Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that "the need for proper salary adjustments in the postal service is a desperate need—one which calls for immediate action."

The only question which remains, then, and the only disagreement which exists is just how best and most equitably to provide such an increase.

That is a task at which both the Senate and House of Representatives committees are hard at work. I am certain they will arrive at an agreement which will be acceptable to both Houses of the Congress. Certainly, I hope so.

There are basic disagreements among the various groups of Government employees themselves on the best and most equitable method of providing an increase.

But I am sure that these Government employees themselves want to be fair about the matter. That is the impression I have gained from the hundreds with whom I have discussed the problem. They are fine, intelligent people and they want only what is coming to them.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we in the Congress will measure up to our responsibility in this matter and reach agreement quickly so that this long overdue pay adjustment does not get bogged down and thus be lost to the hundreds of thousands who so richly deserve it.

#### ADDITIONAL 1955 COTTON ALLOTMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3952) to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Chair was in error in stating that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment; they were ordered on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was about to make a parliamentary inquiry in that regard. My understanding was that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say that our Government at present has about \$8½ billion invested in surplus commodities. By next winter the amount will rise to about \$10 billion. If the pending bill passes, it looks now as if the administration and the Department of Agriculture will have to ask

Congress to raise the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to possibly \$15 billion. In the meantime every billion dollars worth of commodities that piles up depresses the market at home and abroad.

The pending bill is a cotton bill. The foreign cotton market has been depressed now for some time, simply because foreign countries do not know what the United States is going to do with surplus cotton, much of it of low quality.

Markets both at home and abroad feel the effect of excessive surpluses. I do not mean reasonable surpluses; I mean excessive surpluses. The last word I have received is that up to now, as I have said, the Government has about \$8½ billion invested in commodities.

I agree that if Congress is going to permit a considerable expansion of cotton acreage in violation of the intent of Congress, we should also permit an increase in wheat acreage. We must be prepared to meet conditions which are bound to arise if the pending bill is enacted into law.

I assume the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is ready to raise the debt limit substantially. I hear no affirmative answer from him, Mr. President; I assume he is. But I think we ought to know where we are going.

I hope the bill will be defeated.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I could not let the statement made by my friend, the Senator from Vermont, go unchallenged. The Agriculture Department does not have surplus agricultural commodities amounting to \$8 billion. All the holdings of the Commodity Credit Corporation plus all of the loans they have made on commodities would not reach that amount. I do not believe most of these loans are bad loans—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend until the Senate is in order? Let there be order. Those wishing to converse will please retire from the Chamber.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, wheat is probably in the worst surplus situation of the major crops, but as late as 1952 the Federal Government asked the farmers to increase wheat production. There was a carryover that year of only 250 million bushels.

Last year, at the request of the Government, wheat farmers, by an overwhelming majority, voted to accept a 22½-percent cut in their acreage. As a result of the reduction in acreage, wheat production this year just about held even with the sales and the use of wheat in this country together with exports. To be exact, I think the carryover this year was increased by about 59 million bushels.

This year, 1955, farmers are taking another reduction in wheat acreage, which will mean, even if crop conditions are good, that they will produce far less wheat than we can expect to use in the United States and export. Wheat farmers are taking a terrific licking. The income of the farmers of this Nation

has declined 22 percent since February 1951.

The pending bill would give relief to only a very small percentage of the small farmers of the United States. Under the cotton bill, as it would be finally amended, the total increased acreage which would be allotted would not be very much. I was hoping the Senate would sustain the committee action, which would add only about 170,000 acres. It would not help a single farmer who had more than 4 acres of cotton, other than a small allotment for Nevada and Illinois. Since the bill was changed to help the larger cotton farmers, certainly no Senator representing a wheat State could stand idly by and not make some attempt to help the wheat farmers of his State, many of whom are veterans.

The total cost to the Government would be very small indeed—maybe less than the cost to political subdivisions if these small farmers are forced off the land and into the cities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not intend to take the time of the Senate except to say there is a great deal of solemn truth in what the Senator from North Dakota has said. This bill would add a small amount of cotton acreage, but if that amount of good could be done for the farmers I think some of the cotton might start to flow to the old markets which had been the markets of the American cotton farmer.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I agree there is considerable truth in what the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] has said. The wheat farmer is in bad shape today. The shape he is in could be stated in 30 seconds, but it would be very hard to say how to get him out of it. When the books are checked, it will be found that my estimate that there is approximately \$8½ billion invested in surplus crops is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the final passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KIRGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr.

CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

I also announce that on this vote the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 51, as follows:

## YEAS—39

|               |                 |           |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Anderson      | Hennings        | McCarthy  |
| Barkley       | Hill            | McClellan |
| Bible         | Humphrey        | Monroney  |
| Carlson       | Jackson         | Morse     |
| Case, S. Dak. | Johnson, Tex.   | Mundt     |
| Clements      | Johnston, S. C. | Neely     |
| Daniel        | Kerr            | O'Mahoney |
| Douglas       | Langer          | Sparkman  |
| Eastland      | Lehman          | Stennis   |
| Fulbright     | Long            | Symington |
| George        | Magnuson        | Thurmond  |
| Goldwater     | Malone          | Thye      |
| Hayden        | Mansfield       | Young     |

## NAYS—51

|             |              |              |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Alken       | Dworshak     | McNamara     |
| Allott      | Ellender     | Millikin     |
| Barrett     | Ervin        | Pastore      |
| Beall       | Flanders     | Payne        |
| Bender      | Frear        | Potter       |
| Bennett     | Gore         | Purtell      |
| Bricker     | Green        | Robertson    |
| Bridges     | Hickenlooper | Saltonstall  |
| Bush        | Holland      | Schoeppel    |
| Butler      | Hruska       | Scott        |
| Byrd        | Ives         | Smathers     |
| Capehart    | Jenner       | Smith, Maine |
| Case, N. J. | Kefauver     | Smith, N. J. |
| Cotton      | Knowland     | Watkins      |
| Curtis      | Kuchel       | Welker       |
| Dirksen     | Martin, Iowa | Wiley        |
| Duff        | Martin, Pa.  | Williams     |

## NOT VOTING—6

|         |         |           |
|---------|---------|-----------|
| Chavez  | Kilgore | Neuberger |
| Kennedy | Murray  | Russell   |

So the bill (H. R. 3952) was not passed. Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill failed to pass.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### INCREASE IN RATES OF COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES IN THE FIELD SERVICE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1, Calendar 44, the so-called postal pay bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1), which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment to strike

out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) except as provided in subsection (b), the rates of basic compensation, other than rates referred to in section 2 of this act, of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service whose rates of compensation are prescribed by the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1945, as amended, are hereby increased by 10 percent or \$400 per annum, whichever is the greater.

(b) Each of the rates increased by subsection (a) shall then be adjusted to the

nearest multiple of \$100; but in any case in which adjustment to the nearest multiple of \$100 would result in an increase under this section of less than \$400, such adjustment shall be to the next higher multiple of \$100.

SEC. 2. (a) The rates of fixed compensation per annum of carriers in the rural delivery service are hereby increased by \$430 per annum.

(b) Section 8 (a) of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended by striking out the table relating to post offices of the fourth class and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

#### "Post offices of the 4th class

| "Gross receipts       | Grades and salaries of postmasters |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                       | 1                                  | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       | 6       | 7       |
| \$1,300 to \$1,499.99 | \$2,870                            | \$2,955 | \$3,040 | \$3,125 | \$3,210 | \$3,295 | \$3,380 |
| \$1,100 to \$1,299.99 | 2,740                              | 2,820   | 2,900   | 2,980   | 3,060   | 3,140   | 3,220   |
| \$1,000 to \$1,099.99 | 2,560                              | 2,635   | 2,710   | 2,785   | 2,860   | 2,935   | 3,010   |
| \$900 to \$999.99     | 2,390                              | 2,460   | 2,530   | 2,600   | 2,670   | 2,740   | 2,810   |
| \$800 to \$899.99     | 2,240                              | 2,305   | 2,370   | 2,435   | 2,500   | 2,565   | 2,630   |
| \$700 to \$799.99     | 2,100                              | 2,160   | 2,220   | 2,280   | 2,340   | 2,400   | 2,460   |
| \$600 to \$699.99     | 1,930                              | 1,985   | 2,040   | 2,095   | 2,150   | 2,205   | 2,260   |
| \$500 to \$599.99     | 1,740                              | 1,790   | 1,840   | 1,890   | 1,940   | 1,990   | 2,040   |
| \$450 to \$499.99     | 1,580                              | 1,625   | 1,670   | 1,715   | 1,760   | 1,805   | 1,850   |
| \$400 to \$449.99     | 1,460                              | 1,500   | 1,540   | 1,580   | 1,620   | 1,660   | 1,700   |
| \$350 to \$399.99     | 1,340                              | 1,375   | 1,410   | 1,445   | 1,480   | 1,515   | 1,550   |
| \$300 to \$349.99     | 1,220                              | 1,250   | 1,280   | 1,310   | 1,340   | 1,370   | 1,400   |
| \$250 to \$299.99     | 1,070                              | 1,095   | 1,120   | 1,145   | 1,170   | 1,195   | 1,220   |
| \$200 to \$249.99     | 930                                | 950     | 970     | 990     | 1,010   | 1,030   | 1,050   |
| \$150 to \$199.99     | 750                                | 765     | 780     | 795     | 810     | 825     | 840     |
| \$100 to \$149.99     | 570                                | 580     | 590     | 600     | 610     | 620     | 630     |
| Less than \$100       | 350                                | 355     | 360     | 365     | 370     | 375     | 380     |

"Each postmaster at an office of the fourth class shall be placed in grade 1 and shall be entitled to be advanced 1 grade for each year's satisfactory service performed subsequent to the effective date of this paragraph, as a postmaster, in an office of the fourth class or as a postmaster or supervisor subject to the provisions of section 10, until he reaches grade 7. Such advancement shall take effect at the beginning of the first quarter following the completion of the year's service upon which it is based except that if it is based entirely upon prior service, it shall take effect upon the date of commencement of the most recent period of service as a postmaster at an office of the fourth class."

(c) The rates of basic compensation of employees of the postal service paid on an hourly or part-time basis are hereby increased by 20 cents per hour.

SEC. 3. Such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 9 a new section as follows:

"Sec. 10. (a) Each postmaster (other than a postmaster at an office of the fourth class), and each supervisor whose compensation is fixed in accordance with section 8 (a), 9, 13 (a), 14 (a), 15 (a), 16 (a), 18 (a), or 19 (b) of this act, shall be entitled to receive additional basic compensation at the rate of \$100 per annum for each year's satisfactory service, whether continuous or intermittent, performed subsequent to the effective date of this section as such a postmaster or supervisor or as a postmaster at an office of the fourth class.

"(b) Additional basic compensation under this section shall become payable at the beginning of the first quarter following the completion of the year's service upon which it is based. In determining length of service for the purposes of this section, all service, whether continuous or intermittent, in a position the compensation for which is fixed pursuant to any of the provisions referred to in subsection (a) shall be included. No postmaster or supervisor shall receive more than six increases in basic compensation under this section."

SEC. 4. This act shall not apply to skilled-trades employees of the mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees who are paid on a fee or contract basis.

SEC. 5. (a) In the exercise of the authority granted by section 81 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended, the Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized and directed to grant, as of the effective date of this act, additional compensation to postal employees of the Canal Zone Government, based on the additional compensation granted by this act to similar employees in the field service of the Post Office Department of the United States.

(b) This act shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, no rate of compensation which is \$14,800 or more per annum shall be increased by this act or pursuant to any amendment made by this act, and no rate of compensation shall be increased by this act or pursuant to any such amendment to an amount in excess of \$14,800 per annum.

SEC. 7. (a) This act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after December 31, 1954.

(b) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid under this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began after December 31, 1954, and ending with the date of his retirement, or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began after December

31, 1954, and ending with the date of his death.

(c) In the case of any postmaster, officer, or employee who entered the field service of the Post Office Department after the first day of the first pay period which began after December 31, 1954, and prior to, or on, the date of enactment of this act, the term "effective date," as used in this act, means the day of entry of such postmaster, officer, or employee into the field service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

#### POSTAL PAY RAISE LONG OVERDUE EQUAL INFLATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the proposed pay raise for the carriers, clerks, postal transport, and motor vehicle employees is long overdue. The ultimate effect of the deliberate inflation over two decades has finally caught up with the Congress. The chickens have come home to roost, as a result of unbalanced budgets and cheapening money.

#### TWO WAYS TO REDUCE WAGES

There are two ways to reduce wages. One long recognized way was simply to reduce the pay. The more subtle method, which has become customary over two decades, is to cheapen the

value of money, resulting in higher prices.

The subtle method of inflation has cast less immediate blame on Congress and has always put the postal workers behind, and they never catch up. The increase proposed by the pending legislation is long overdue.

#### ANALYSIS OF HOUSE BILL 4644

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing an analysis of House bill 4644.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### Analysis of H. R. 4644

| Classification  | Proposed level | Number of employees | Present salary  | Proposed salary | Ultimate dollar increase | Ultimate percentage increase | Immediate dollar increase | Immediate percentage increase | Years to reach top grade | Amount of yearly step increases |
|---|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Janitor  | 1              | 3,202               | \$2,870-\$3,270 | \$2,870-\$3,470 | \$200                    | 6.1                          | \$200                     | 6.1                           |                          |                                 |
| 2. Elevator operator                                    | 2              | 1,166               | 2,970-3,370     | 3,080-3,710     | 340                      | 10.0                         | 235                       | 6.9                           | 1                        | \$105                           |
| 3. Order filler   | 2              | 212                 | 2,950-3,430     | 3,080-3,710     | 280                      | 8.1                          | 280                       | 8.1                           |                          |                                 |
| 4. Clerks, 3d-class post office                         | 2              | 19,651              | 2,770-3,070     | 3,080-3,710     | 640                      | 20.8                         | 220                       | 6.4                           | 4                        | 105                             |
| 5. Guard  | 3              | 650                 | 3,170-3,570     | 3,330-3,990     | 420                      | 11.7                         | 310                       | 8.6                           | 1                        | 110                             |
| 6. File clerk   | 3              | 1,250               | 3,270-4,070     | 3,330-3,990     | -80                      | -10.9                        |                           |                               |                          |                                 |
| 7. Typist   | 3              | 125                 | 3,270-4,070     | 3,330-3,990     | -80                      | -10.9                        |                           |                               |                          |                                 |
| 8. Mail handler   | 3              | 25,712              | 3,170-3,470     | 3,330-3,990     | 520                      | 15.0                         | 300                       | 8.6                           | 2                        | 110                             |
| 9. Garageman  | 3              | 624                 | 3,170-3,470     | 3,330-3,990     | 520                      | 15.0                         | 300                       | 8.6                           | 2                        | 110                             |
| 10. Special-delivery messengers                         | 4              | 4,533               | 3,170-3,770     | 3,590-4,280     | 510                      | 13.5                         | 280                       | 7.3                           | 2                        | 115                             |
| 11. Motor vehicle operator                              | 5              | 4,160               | 3,270-4,070     | 3,640-4,360     | 290                      | 7.1                          | 290                       | 7.1                           |                          |                                 |
| 12. City carriers                                       | 5              | 121,731             | 3,270-4,070     | 3,640-4,360     | 290                      | 7.1                          | 290                       | 7.1                           |                          |                                 |
| 13. Distribution clerk                                  | 5              | 113,890             | 3,270-4,070     | 3,640-4,360     | 290                      | 7.1                          | 290                       | 7.1                           |                          |                                 |
| 14. Window clerks                                       | 5              | 64,750              | 3,270-4,070     | 3,640-4,360     | 290                      | 7.1                          | 290                       | 7.1                           |                          |                                 |
| 15. Automotive mechanics                                | 6              | 1,192               | 3,270-4,070     | 3,880-4,630     | 560                      | 13.7                         | 310                       | 7.8                           | 2                        | 125                             |
| 16. Transfer clerk                                      | 6              | 1,459               | 3,470-4,270     | 3,880-4,630     | 360                      | 8.4                          | 360                       | 8.4                           |                          |                                 |
| 17. Distribution clerk, railway post office             | 6              | 17,107              | 3,470-4,270     | 3,880-4,630     | 360                      | 8.4                          | 360                       | 8.4                           |                          |                                 |
| 18. Claims clerk, post office                           | 6              | 54                  | 3,270-4,070     | 3,880-4,630     | 560                      | 13.7                         | 260                       | 6.3                           | 5                        | 125                             |
| 19. Postmaster, small, third-class office               | 6              | 162                 | 2,883-3,645     | 3,880-4,630     | 985                      | 27.7                         | 235                       | 6.3                           | 5                        | 125                             |
| 20. Claims clerk  | 7              | 105                 | 3,470-4,070     | 4,190-5,030     | 960                      | 23.5                         | 260                       | 6.3                           | 5                        | 140                             |
| 21. Postmaster, third-class post office                 | 7              | 8,005               | 2,883-4,298     | 4,190-5,030     | 732                      | 16.9                         | 452                       | 10.5                          | 2                        | 140                             |
| 22. Foreman, mails                                      | 8              | 564                 | 4,787-4,896     | 4,530-5,460     | 564                      | 11.5                         | 409                       | 8.3                           | 1                        | 155                             |
| 23. Postmaster, third-class post office                 | 8              | 1,162               | 3,781-4,298     | 4,530-5,460     | 1,162                    | 27.0                         | 387                       | 9.0                           | 5                        | 155                             |
| 24. General foreman, Railway Post Office                | 9              | 640                 | 5,114-5,270     | 4,890-5,910     | 640                      | 12.1                         | 470                       | 8.9                           | 1                        | 170                             |
| 25. Assistant postmaster, first class                   | 9              | 940                 | 4,890-5,070     | 4,890-5,910     | 940                      | 18.1                         | 430                       | 8.4                           | 3                        | 170                             |
| 26. Postmaster, second-class post office                | 9              | 840                 | 4,770-5,070     | 4,890-5,910     | 840                      | 16.5                         | 330                       | 6.5                           | 3                        | 170                             |
| 27. General foreman, mails                              | 10             | 1,020               | 5,005-5,370     | 5,280-6,390     | 1,020                    | 18.9                         | 465                       | 8.6                           | 3                        | 185                             |
| 28. Postmaster, small first-class post office           | 10             | 2,639               | 5,370-5,570     | 5,280-6,390     | 820                      | 14.7                         | 450                       | 8.0                           | 2                        | 185                             |
| 29. Building superintendent                             | 11             | 7                   | 5,970-6,270     | 5,800-7,000     | 730                      | 11.6                         | 530                       | 8.4                           | 1                        | 200                             |
| 30. Postmaster, first-class post office                 | 11             | 1,663               | 5,670-6,170     | 5,800-7,000     | 830                      | 13.4                         | 430                       | 6.9                           | 2                        | 200                             |
| 31. Tour superintendent                                 | 12             | 175                 | 5,270-5,670     | 6,380-7,700     | 2,030                    | 35.8                         | 710                       | 12.5                          | 6                        | 220                             |
| 32. Postmaster, 1st-class post office                   | 12             | 865                 | 6,370-7,070     | 6,380-7,700     | 630                      | 8.9                          | 630                       | 8.9                           |                          |                                 |
| 33. Postal inspector                                    | 13             | 385                 | 5,970-6,770     | 7,020-8,460     | 1,690                    | 24.9                         | 490                       | 7.2                           | 6                        | 240                             |
| 34. Postmaster, 1st-class post office                   | 13             | 122                 | 6,570-7,370     | 7,020-8,460     | 1,090                    | 14.7                         | 610                       | 8.2                           | 2                        | 240                             |
| 35. Station superintendent                              | 14             | 15                  | 6,470-7,770     | 7,730-9,290     | 2,820                    | 43.5                         | 1,260                     | 19.4                          | 6                        | 260                             |
| 36. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office         | 14             | 54                  | 6,070-7,770     | 7,730-9,290     | 3,220                    | 53.0                         | 1,660                     | 27.3                          | 6                        | 260                             |
| 37. Postmaster, 1st-class post office                   | 14             | 120                 | 7,370-7,770     | 7,730-9,290     | 1,520                    | 19.5                         | 480                       | 6.18                          | 4                        | 260                             |
| 38. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office         | 15             | 44                  | 6,270-6,870     | 8,500-10,180    | 3,310                    | 48.1                         | 1,630                     | 26.0                          | 6                        | 280                             |
| 39. Postmaster, 1st-class post office                   | 15             | 54                  | 7,770-8,770     | 8,500-10,180    | 1,410                    | 16.0                         | 570                       | 6.5                           | 3                        | 280                             |
| 40. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office         | 16             | 15                  | 7,070-8,770     | 9,350-11,150    | 4,080                    | 57.7                         | 2,280                     | 32.2                          | 6                        | 300                             |
| 41. Postmaster, 1st-class post office                   | 16             | 34                  | 8,770-9,770     | 9,350-11,150    | 1,380                    | 14.1                         | 780                       | 7.9                           | 2                        | 300                             |
| 42. General superintendent, PTS Division                | 17             | 9                   | 8,470-10,300    | 10,300-12,220   | 3,750                    | 44.3                         | 1,830                     | 21.6                          | 6                        | 320                             |
| 43. Assistant postmaster                                | 17             | 10                  | 7,970-8,470     | 10,300-12,220   | 3,750                    | 44.3                         | 1,830                     | 21.6                          | 6                        | 320                             |
| 44. Postmaster, 1st-class post office                   | 17             | 10                  | 10,770-11,770   | 10,300-12,220   | 1,450                    | 13.5                         | 810                       | 7.5                           | 2                        | 320                             |
| 45. General superintendent, PTS Division                | 18             | 3                   | 8,470-11,400    | 13,440-14,800   | 4,970                    | 58.7                         | 2,930                     | 34.6                          | 6                        | 340                             |
| 46. Assistant postmaster, largest 1st-class post office | 18             | 2                   | 8,470-11,400    | 13,440-14,800   | 4,970                    | 58.7                         | 2,930                     | 34.6                          | 6                        | 340                             |
| 47. Postmaster, 1st-class post office                   | 18             | 15                  | 11,770-13,770   | 14,800-16,800   | 1,670                    | 14.2                         | 990                       | 8.5                           | 2                        | 340                             |
| 48. Postmaster, 1st-class post office                   | 19             | 10                  | 12,770-13,770   | 14,800-16,800   | 890                      | 6.5                          | 890                       | 6.03                          |                          |                                 |
| 49. Postmaster, largest 1st-class post office           | 20             | 2                   | 13,770-14,800   | 16,800-18,800   | 1,030                    | 7.5                          | 1,030                     | 7.5                           |                          |                                 |
| 50. Regional director                                   | 21             | 12                  | 12,000-12,800   | 14,800-16,800   | 2,000                    | 15.6                         | 2,000                     | 15.6                          |                          |                                 |

#### BREAKDOWN ON POSTAL PAY

Mr. MALONE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a table which breaks down the 234,562 regular carriers, clerks, and postal transport employees in level 5, and the motor vehicle employees.

Of 234,562 regular carriers, clerks, and postal transport employees in level 5, and motor vehicle employees in level 5, 213,121 would receive increases of less than \$300 under House bill 4644. 180,086 employees would receive increases of less than 7 percent.

The table shows the number of employees in each of the present pay grades in the classifications enumerated in this paragraph, the actual dollar amount

they would receive and the percentage pay increase they would receive under House bill 4644.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

| Present grade | Number of employees | Dollar increase | Percent increase |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 1             | 1,492               | \$370           | 11.3             |
| 2             | 2,684               | 270             | 8.0              |
| 3             | 12,683              | 290             | 8.3              |
| 4             | 7,121               | 310             | 8.68             |
| 5             | 12,828              | 330             | 8.9              |
| 6             | 23,906              | 230             | 6.1              |
| 7             | 20,583              | 250             | 6.4              |
| 8             | 13,715              | 270             | 6.8              |
| 9             | 17,608              | 290             | 7.1              |
| 9A            | 39,517              | 290             | 6.9              |
| 9B            | 30,723              | 290             | 6.7              |
| 9C            | 51,642              | 290             | 6.6              |

#### RAISE OVERDUE AND SHOULD PASS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the proposed 10 percent increase for postal workers at this time is little enough. The bill should pass.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to discuss with Members of the Senate the bill (S. 1) which I, with 20 other Senators, introduced, and which was approved recently by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I sincerely hope that we can give prompt and favorable consideration to this very important and long-overdue measure. Attaching to its significance are the number of Senators who joined in its sponsorship, and did so with such dispatch that it was the first bill introduced in the

Senate in the opening session of the 84th Congress.

Speaking of the amounts called for by S. 1, personally I think they are small enough. I want that understood in the beginning.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle who were present here last year need not be reminded that the 83d Congress enacted pay legislation which many of us believed was long overdue even at that time. I did not find many Members of the House or of the Senate at that time who disagreed with the proposal that Federal employees should have had the increase then. When we know that employees of the Government should have their salaries increased, I have never believed that such increase should depend on some other proposal such as an increase in the first class mail rate from 3 cents to 4 cents.

My distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], is to be commended upon his able leadership, understanding of the plight and problems of the rank-and-file postal worker, and his diligence in guiding the legislation to passage last year. The task he accomplished was neither easy nor pleasant, for that bill, like S. 1, the bill now being considered, did not embrace the administration's job reclassification plan. Time has proved that he was right in not bringing before the Senate and supporting the administration's quickly conceived and ill-advised reclassification plan, but chose instead to support a straight pay bill similar to S. 1, the bill we are now considering.

I do not doubt that after passage of the pay bill sponsored by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the then chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, our postal workers believed with reasonable justification that an immediate increase in their pay was assured. Unfortunately, however, the increase voted by the 83d Congress were not enacted into law, and thus the hopes of these workers were dashed. It is to the everlasting credit of these good and faithful postal employees that their understandable disappointment was not reflected in the performance of their daily duties and service to the individuals, institutions, and businesses that make up this great Nation of ours.

S. 1, as amended, is based on many of the same factors which justified favorable congressional action last year. The economic plight of postal workers was brought out in the hearings then, and emphasized in even more vivid terms this year. An increase in the pay and a job reclassification plan for postal workers has been recommended by the administration, the Post Office Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Service Commission. The committee heard a long list of witnesses, including officials of the several postal employee organizations, individual employees, and private citizens. On one thing there seems to be rather complete agreement, namely, that a pay raise is urgently needed and completely justified. As evidenced by the minority views, there is a difference of opinion: first, as to how the raises should be accom-

plished; and, second, with respect to the amount of the increases; and, finally, the cost involved. These are matters worthy of our most careful consideration. For that reason, I should like, first, to discuss briefly the bill as approved by the committee, and then these differences:

Section 1 (a) provides an increase of 10 percent, or \$400, whichever is greater, to the main body of postal employees. That is to say, those employees who need it most would receive at least a \$400 increase in their salaries. Employees whose pay is not raised in accordance with this general formula are provided for in an equitable manner under other sections of the bill.

Section 1 (b) provides for the adjustment of pay rates to the nearest multiple of \$100, except that where the adjustment results in an increase of less than \$400 it shall be made to the next higher multiple of \$100.

Section 2 provides increases to the groups of employees not included under section 1. Under subsection (a) rural carriers are given flat increases of \$430, to correspond with the average increase received by clerks and city carriers. Subsection (b) establishes a new table of rates of basic compensation of fourth-class postmasters. This table represents current rates plus 10 percent, adjusted to the nearest lower multiple of \$10, with additional grades in each rate to provide 6 annual increases in even amounts per rate, ranging from \$5 a year in the lowest to \$85 a year in the highest grade in the schedule. Subsection (c) of section 2 gives hourly employees an increase of 20 cents an hour, an amount equivalent to a \$400 annual increase.

Section 3 provides 6 annual increases of \$100 each for postmasters in the first-, second-, and third-class offices, and for supervisors in every area of the postal service who do not now have such increases.

In order to keep the record straight, it should be noted that an inadvertent error occurs on page 11 of Report No. 41. This paragraph indicates that certain officers and supervisors in the postal service are excluded from the periodic step-increase provisions of S. 1. Every officer and supervisor enumerated in this paragraph as being excluded is, in fact, specifically included.

Other provisions of the bill establish a ceiling of \$14,800 on salaries to conform to the limit under the Classification Act; set the effective date of the increases back to the beginning of the first pay period commencing in 1955; extend the increases to employees in the Canal Zone and Guam; and set forth how adjustments are to be made and the bill is to be administered.

Mr. President, as I stated earlier, there appears to be rather complete agreement that a pay raise for postal workers and other Federal employees is well deserved and amply justified. The differences of view in regard to postal raises are:

First. The major differences between S. 1 and S. 773 occur with respect to how the raises are to be applied. S. 773 contains the Department's highly publicized classification plan, which is held

out as the cure to all ills existing in the postal service. Actually, it has created a serious employee morale problem, even though it has not even been enacted. The problem I refer to is the split right down the middle it has wrought between supervision, on the one hand, and the rank and file postal worker, on the other hand. I am confident the open warfare that has raged for well over a year has taken a toll running into untold millions of dollars because of the adverse effect on morale and efficiency. In my opinion, it is high time that the struggle be ended without loss of dignity to either side. That is possible through the prompt passage of S. 1, which is now before the Senate. Why is it possible? Because under S. 1, both sides win an honorable victory.

S. 1 accepts one of the basic elements of a sound classification system by establishing and extending periodic pay increases to postmasters and supervisors in all areas of the postal service. This establishes the foundation upon which to erect other improvements in the near future. Herein lies the victory for the proponents of job classification represented by the postmasters and the supervisors.

S. 1 provides for decent pay increases from top to bottom. Herein lies the victory for the rank-and-file worker. This is because under S. 1 the low-paid worker—the rank-and-file employee—the person who moves the mail from sender to recipient—gets a greater and fairer proportion of the total increase.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. I inquire of the able Senator from South Carolina, who has long and faithfully worked on the problem, whether there has been any indication from the postal employees of a preference for S. 1 or the recommendations of the Postmaster General.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would say that witnesses, representing 80 percent of the postal employees, who appeared before our committee opposed the Postmaster General's reclassification plan.

Mr. NEELY. Was not that fact established by testimony given by the heads of the organizations of letter carriers, post-office clerks and others?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. NEELY. In other words, for every 1 in favor of the Postmaster General's plan of reclassification, 4 postal employees are against it. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At least that many.

Mr. President, the second difference is in regard to the amount of the raises. S. 1 provides for an increase of 10 percent, or \$400, whichever is greater. Contrasted with this is the so-called 6½ percent average increase provided in S. 773, the administration proposal. As we all know, figures can be misleading, particularly so when the word "average" creeps in. Use of the word "average" in connection with S. 773 reminds me of how the word "average" was used by an old and dear friend of mine to hide an

embarrassing condition existing in his school class. He would brag that the average intelligence of his class was above that of the other classes in the school, and he was right. But the whole town knew that his class consisted of just two children—one of whom was a dunce and the other of whom was a genius—yet, the average intelligence of his class was above average.

So, let us not be confused by the use of fancy terms in our consideration of S. 1 and S. 773. Rather, let us consider exactly what each bill does.

S. 1 provides for a general increase of 10 percent, or \$400, whichever is greater. There is no ambiguity here nor is there doubt as to what employees will get in the way of a pay increase under S. 1.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator state for the record whether the increase provided by Senate bill 1 for the postal workers is greater or less percentage-wise than the increase which Congress has recently voted for its Members and for the judiciary?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I did not mean to bring up that question, but since the Senator has raised it, of course, I must answer his question. Congress has voted itself an increase of 50 percent. The increase provided in S. 1 is 10 percent.

Mr. NEELY. Does the Senator believe that Congress can consistently vote for less than a 10-percent increase for postal workers, after having voted an increase of 50 percent for its own Members?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I did not vote for the 50-percent increase for myself, but I shall vote for the 10-percent increase in the salaries of postal workers.

Mr. NEELY. I did not vote for the 50-percent increase, but I certainly intend to vote for the 10-percent increase in the salaries of postal employees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from West Virginia voted just as I did, and as I shall vote in this instance.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator can rest assured that I shall vote for the increase proposed by the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, let us see what S. 773 would do for the postal worker.

First. The 15 directors of the newly created regional office would get increases of from 15.6 percent to 23.3 percent, amounting to from \$2,000 to \$2,800 a year each. These are completely new jobs just created by the Postmaster General under somewhat doubtful legal authority, and the cost to the taxpayers is an additional \$5 million.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. With reference to the point the Senator has just raised, I read a very large headline in a newspaper yesterday which said that a bill which was recently voted upon in the House, I think H. R. 4644, provided an

increase of 7.6 percent. That is the average increase, and it includes very large increases for those in the top brackets.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I have before me an analysis of H. R. 4644. The general superintendent of the Transport Service Division has a present salary of \$8,470 a year. The new salary would be from \$11,400 to \$13,440. That is an increase of 58.7 percent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was one of the groups helping to make up the 20 percent of the postal groups supporting the Postmaster General's plan.

Mr. PASTORE. The increase in this category is included in the 7.6 percent about which we are speaking generally.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. That is the reason why I stressed the average increase a few moments ago.

Mr. PASTORE. What increase would a letter carrier receive under H. R. 4644? Would it be 7.6 percent, or lower than that amount?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My information is that it would be lower.

Mr. PASTORE. Therefore, it is a fact that the great majority of the employees of the Post Office Department, would not be given a 7.6 percent increase in salary. By and large, most of them would receive less than a 7.6 percent increase.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. PASTORE. But only because some others in the same department would get a 53 percent increase—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course, that greatly increases the average. If we provide peanuts for the rank and file who need an increase the most and gravy for the few at the top, the average increase is somewhat distorted.

Second. Excluding the 12 largest cities, 355 postmasters in the next largest offices will get immediate and eventual increases of from 13.4 to 27 percent, amounting to from \$1,450 to \$2,410 a year each.

Third. The assistant postmasters in the 125 largest first-class offices will get immediate and eventual increases of from 53 to 62.2 percent, amounting to from \$3,220 to \$4,970 a year, each. Mr. President, I repeat, if you please, under S. 773, 125 assistant postmasters will get immediate and eventual increases of from 53 to 62.2 percent amounting to, in some cases, \$4,970 a year each.

Fourth. To go further, 199 superintendents will get immediate and eventual increases of from 43 to 44 percent, amounting to \$2,430 to \$3,750 a year each.

By this time it should be clear that if those at the top get increases of 30, 40, or 50 percent and higher, someone along the line will not get very much. And that, Mr. President, is exactly the case. The rank-and-file postal worker will get a pitiful small increase. So that there may be no misunderstanding, let

me be specific. The some 65,000 window clerks who sell stamps, insure packages, and serve us in a hundred other ways; the over 110,000 distribution clerks who sort outgoing mail for dispatch and incoming mail for delivery; and, the over 120,000 city carriers who lug the mail on their backs to your very doorstep will get immediate and eventual increases of from \$210 to \$320 a year each. Yes; under S. 773 the average may be 6.5 percent; but, like the product we obtain from good Jersey cows, S. 773 is rich with butterfat, but the cream is at the top.

Mr. President, the third and final major difference is with respect to the matter of cost. It is a rather common practice to refer to the cost of one measure as amounting to X number of dollars, and another measure as costing Y number of dollars. Let me assure you, my friends, that the real cost of any measure is to a great extent determined by the effect it has on the spirit of an organization.

I want that to sink in. A pay measure, though lower in initial payroll cost, which does not raise the morale of our postal workers will prove costly to the Government.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from South Carolina believe that if the postal and civil service employees of the United States are given an average increase in pay of only 7.6 percent, the budget will be balanced?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course, the budget will not be balanced.

Mr. PASTORE. If they are given a 10 percent increase, will the budget be balanced?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It will not be balanced, but I think the overall cost will be less.

Mr. PASTORE. The budget will be out of balance anyway, will it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The budget is now out of balance, and will stay out of balance for a while, unless the Government stops giving away so many billions of dollars to foreign countries. That is where our money goes—and it goes in the billions of dollars, not in such small amounts as are proposed in the postal pay bill.

On the other hand, a pay measure, though perhaps higher in initial payroll costs, which raises the morale of our postal workers will prove to be the cheapest to the Government in the long run.

Enactment of S. 1 will cause, according to Post Office Department estimates, an initial payroll adjustment amounting to approximately \$220 million. Spokesmen for the administration indicated in the hearings that one-third of the cost of legislation to increase the salaries of Federal employees would be absorbed. This would cut the actual figure to something in the neighborhood of \$145 million to \$150 million. Taking into account the extra amount of Federal income taxes that would be collected, the net cost to the Government would be some \$120 million.

In comparing costs of one bill against another, it is well to keep in mind that initial figures do not always tell the complete story. Pay bills are somewhat like automobiles, in that the upkeep must be considered along with the initial cost before a wise decision can be made as to which car is the cheapest to own. In this respect I note that the upkeep of the administration's pay plan is far greater than that of S. 1. Whereas, under S. 1, all postmasters and supervisors would receive annual increases of \$100, under the administration's plan they would receive annual increases of up to \$400. To be specific, an employee starting out in a position in level 19 at a salary of \$12,500 would, after only 6 years, receive \$14,660 a year under the administration bill; or, put another way, his pay would increase by \$2,160 a year, or 17.2 percent, solely by virtue of his having served in the position for a period of 6 years.

The Postmaster General in a press release dated October 31, 1954, claims to have saved \$101 million during the fiscal year 1954 through economy and efficiency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina will yield to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum in order that I thereafter may propose a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the bill at a specified time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall be glad to yield, although I will be finished in a minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It seems to me that this is a good start, which should be continued; and if continued, the Post Office Department could absorb much of the cost of the bill.

In closing, I remind Senators that the administration's classification plan, which has shattered the morale of postal workers in their home towns and mine, was received with such doubt that it was rejected in the House by an overwhelming majority only a few days ago.

Mr. President, a vote for S. 1 will be a vote on the side of improved employee morale, increased production, and greater efficiency in our postal service. It will be a vote on the side of the rank and file of our postal employees.

A 10-percent increase as provided in S. 1, in my opinion, is the smallest increase Congress should provide at the present time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not wish to interrupt the Senator a moment ago; but, as I understand the bill, if the income tax payments to be made by the recipients of the proposed increase are deducted, the total cost to the Government will be \$120 million. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It would be approximately \$120 million;

after tax returns and at least a one-third absorption.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator think it would be consistent for Senators who recently voted a 50 percent pay increase for themselves to deny a 10 percent increase to the postal workers?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I cannot see, to save my life, how Senators who voted for a 50-percent increase in pay for themselves could now turn around and not vote a 10-percent increase for the postal workers.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that I shall support the bill whole-heartedly.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In view of what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has said, would it not be more consistent to vote for a 50-percent increase in pay for Government employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is important that the Federal employees be granted an adequate increase; and the hearings brought out that a 10-percent increase was reasonable.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina knows, does he not, that the hearings developed that if the postal workers received a 15-percent increase, they would not have any more take-home pay than they had in 1939?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator from North Dakota has raised the question of take-home pay. When we consider the living costs in 1939 and the living costs today, frequently we fail to take into consideration that in 1939 it was necessary for Federal employees to pay only a very small income tax; yet now the average return to the Government in Federal income tax is over 20 percent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to state that the proposed 10-percent increase is entirely inadequate. I want to go on record with that statement. I think the increase should be at least 15 percent, in order to give the Federal employees the same amount of take-home pay as they had in 1939.

Furthermore, it was undisputed at the hearings, which I attended, that the increase ought to be 25 percent, in order to place the postal workers on a par with industrial workers.

In the opinion of the senior Senator from North Dakota, this miserable, lousy 10 percent increase is entirely inadequate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will agree with the senior Senator from North Dakota to that extent, because if the employees were given a 15-percent increase they would not be paid any more than what they were receiving in 1939, when take-home pay is taken into consideration.

Mr. LANGER. Why should not the employees receive a 15-percent increase?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee has studied the matter and has come to the conclusion that a 10-percent increase is the amount which should be requested in the bill. The Senator from North Dakota knows I am chairman of the committee, and the Senator from North Dakota helped report the bill. The committee desires to have the Senate pass the bill containing a 10-percent increase, so the bill will go to the House, and action may be taken on it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. As we begin the debate on the postal pay increase bill, I do not want to let the opportunity pass without paying tribute to the chairman of the committee. For years he has worked consistently to bring about an increase in the pay of postal and classified employees. I regret that on this occasion we are not together on the amounts of the proposed increase, but I think both he and I will agree that we are anxious to get a pay increase for Federal employees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks. He, as the ranking minority member of the committee, has been most helpful, and even though he has disagreed with us, he has not tried to prohibit action desired by the majority.

#### PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief statement, with the understanding he will not lose the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have discussed a proposed unanimous-consent agreement with the chairman of the committee, with the ranking minority member of the committee, and with the distinguished minority leader. There were delays in taking up this bill because of the necessity for the consideration of the proposed cotton legislation and the resolutions pertaining to the disposal of the rubber plants, which had to be acted on within a time limit. It appears that if action is to be had on the pay bill this week it will be necessary for the Senate to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, and, if possible, to operate under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting the time for debate.

A proposed agreement has been worked out which appears to be satisfactory to the Senators I have mentioned. The agreement provides that—

During the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, debate on any amendment or motion proposed to the committee substitute, or any appeal arising in connection therewith, shall be limited to 1 hour and 30 minutes—

That is 1 hour and 30 minutes for each amendment, each motion, and each appeal—

to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such amendment or proposal

(including appeals) and the majority leader: *Provided*, That if the majority leader is in favor of any such motion or amendment, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader: *Provided further*, That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

*Provided further*, That debate on the final passage of the bill shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally controlled by the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will allow me to make one more statement, I shall yield for any questions which Senators may desire to ask.

If the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, it is expected to have the Senate meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, and it is hoped that the Senate can finish voting on the bill by 5 o'clock tomorrow evening.

I now yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the unanimous consent agreement is entered into, is it to become effective immediately, or when the Senate meets tomorrow morning?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Does not the Senator from Texas feel he has been a little too generous with the time provided? I think if we could cut the time allowed by 15 minutes on each side, we would be better off.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator that I suggested 1 hour. I could not get an agreement on that time. This is the best agreement I could get. However, if any time on the amendment is not used, the time can be yielded back. The Senator from Virginia has an amendment, and it is expected some of the time on it will be yielded back. I may say it is not planned to have a vote after 5 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. How much time would be allowed on each amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. An hour and a half, to be equally divided.

Mr. LANGER. On each amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether the understanding would be that the unanimous-consent agreement would take effect at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; at the conclusion of the morning hour, with the hope that the morning hour would be concluded at 10:20 or 10:30 o'clock a. m.

Mr. HENNINGS. I wish to say I am a member of the committee, and one of the cosponsors of the bill (S. 1). I have a

long-standing engagement to address the bar association at Chicago, Ill., which will require my leaving here tomorrow afternoon at 2:30. I expect to support the bill, and I hope the debate may be so limited as to give me an opportunity to vote for it. If that is not possible, of course, I still should like to see the unanimous-consent agreement entered into.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas had in mind the engagement of the Senator from Missouri, and obligations of other Senators. That was the reason for my statement.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to say I think the majority leader has worked out a most generous agreement. I sincerely hope we will not have to use as much time as has been covered by the agreement. I hope the Senate will get to a vote on the bill early.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I may say to the majority leader that I believe time on the amendments, and probably on the bill, too, can be cut down so far as the committee is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina may yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, in order that the unanimous-consent agreement may be proposed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business for today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### INCREASE IN RATES OF COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES IN THE FIELD SERVICE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

##### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], I submit the proposed unani-

mous-consent agreement which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

##### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

*Ordered*, That, effective after morning business on March 25, 1955, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, debate on any amendment or motion proposed to the committee substitute, or any appeal arising in connection therewith, shall be limited to 1 hour and 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such amendment or motion (including appeals) and the majority leader: *Provided*, That if the majority leader is in favor of any such motion or amendment, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader: *Provided further*, That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

*Ordered further*, That debate on the question of final passage of the bill shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think I should repeat for the Record what I previously said, namely, that we shall begin the session on tomorrow at 10 a. m., and shall have the usual morning business under the 2-minute limitation on statements. Perhaps we shall not have a quorum call, but shall let this notice show in the Record that we shall commence the session at 10 a. m., so that we shall be able to conclude the morning business and begin at an early hour to proceed under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement which now has been entered.

I should like all Members to know that if the number of motions or appeals which may be made should prevent the Senate from concluding its action on the bill by 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, no votes will be taken on the bill on tomorrow after that time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, I desire to concur in the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered, and which was submitted on behalf of the majority leader and the minority leader. I also wish to concur in expressing hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will be in the Chamber promptly at 10 o'clock tomorrow if they have any matters to submit under the head of morning business.

Furthermore, in order to cooperate with the majority leader, I shall ask the secretary for the minority to notify all Senators on our side of the aisle to be in the Chamber promptly at 10 a. m., so that we shall be able to avoid the necessity of having a quorum call at that time.

I express the hope that on tomorrow we can complete action on the postal pay bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We on this side of the aisle shall follow the same procedure, and all Senators on this side of the aisle will be notified.

I do not wish this opportunity to pass without expressing my deepest appreciation and thanks to the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee for their always excellent cooperation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in one of my favorite poems, Robert Browning says:

Man's reach should exceed his grasp,  
Or what's a heaven for?

That illustrates the philosophy of a good motive—urging a man always to try to be a little bit better than he has been in the past.

In friendship, of course, motive is an essential. I refer to that fact because between good friends of the postal workers there will develop a difference of opinion as to the best way to help them.

In 1935, when a Member of the House of Representatives, I was assigned to the House Committee on Post Office. I served for 2 years on that committee, and during that time became very much interested in the work. I learned a good deal about the operations of the Post Office Department. I met many postal workers and the officials of their State and national organizations.

I learned what a fine group they are—far above the average and patriotic citizens all. This week I asked the Postmaster General whether he had ever found a Communist in the ranks of the postal workers. He had to admit that no one proven to be a Communist had ever been found in the Postal Service, although a very few were questioned for security reasons.

Mr. President, I also learned how appreciative the postal workers are of those who take an interest in their welfare and try to help them. It is no wonder that in the Congress they have many friends.

All the worth-while legislation to improve the status of the postal workers has been enacted since I became a member of the House Committee on Post Office, in 1935. During the ensuing 20 years, we have brought about advances in working conditions, classifications, and salaries which have brought the postal workers up to their present status.

I refer to that fact because during those 20 years, I have supported every bill in favor of the postal workers which has been enacted into law.

Mr. President, as I approach the making of a decision as to what bill I shall favor, I think the many friends I have in Virginia among the postal workers will realize that when I say I honestly believe it will be best for me to support Senate bill 1489, the Carlson bill, which in due time will be offered as a substitute for Senate bill 1, they will know I am sincere in taking that position; and that if I make a mistake, it will be a mistake of the head, not of the heart.

I had planned to discuss—and I hoped very briefly—my reasons for supporting the substitute, but before I do so I feel

that it would be helpful to the Senate in passing on this proposed legislation, in passing on pending bills to increase postal revenues—and certainly we should take such action—and in the consideration of future legislation with respect to the operation of the Post Office Department and the pay and working conditions of the employees, briefly to review the history of the Department.

Many American citizens, knowing how deeply imbued with the spirit of private enterprise were the distinguished delegates to the Constitutional Convention who gathered in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787, have often wondered why they injected one little dose of socialism into an organic law designed to establish a better union on the basis of private enterprise. I will tell the Senate why, but before I do so let me say that later I shall insert all the available statistics of receipts and disbursements of the Post Office Department for 118 years. That is as far back as the records are available. Those statistics will indicate that in 118 years the Post Office Department operated in the red 100 times, a fact which should cause us to be happy that the Founding Fathers decided to have only one socialistic operation in the Government. The reason they decided to do that was that they inherited the postal system from Great Britain, and did not know how to get rid of it.

In colonial days the right to handle the mails belonged to the Crown. The King controlled that function. That is the situation in Europe today. All the monarchies, and all the republics which were formerly monarchies, have government control of the post office. But they do not stop there. They have control of the railroads, telegraph communications, and many other things. But the Crown had control of handling the mails, and that was a source of revenue to the Crown in colonial days.

There were few things that irritated the Colonists more than the exorbitant charge for carrying the mails. With all due deference to that venerable and great statesman, Benjamin Franklin, who for a number of years held the exclusive right to establish post offices and carry the mail for all the colonies, he was bitterly criticized both for the cost of the service and for its inefficiency.

I am reminded of the plan of the Roman emperors, after Julius Caesar had conquered Palestine. They wanted to collect revenue from the conquered province, which was far removed from Rome, so they invited Jews to make bids on the revenue they would collect, and the contract went to the highest bidder. Then he had to go home and collect the amount of his bid, and, in addition, whatever he could collect for his own compensation.

Those tax collectors were called publicans, and their operations were so distasteful to their fellow citizens that two classes of undesirable citizens were designated in Palestine, namely, publicans and sinners; and publicans rated No. 1.

In Colonial days those who were gouging the people for handling the mail

under a monopoly were very unpopular. I must give the venerable Benjamin Franklin credit for one thing. He had a frank, which was very valuable to him, because he could frank Poor Richard's Almanac all over the country free of mailing charges. That was quite a source of revenue in itself. It put him ahead of his competitors. No doubt his successor, the Saturday Evening Post, would very much enjoy such a privilege today. But when the Colonies started stirring for independence, Benjamin Franklin, to his credit, changed the wording of his frank. The stamp, which he gave to all his postmasters, read "Franking Privilege—Free—B. Franklin." He changed it to read "Be Free—Franklin." That got back to King George, who said, "You are fired." So Franklin lost his contract.

Several others had contracts, but when the Continental Congress met in the summer of 1776 in Philadelphia, everyone was complaining about the mail service, so Benjamin Franklin was named the first Postmaster of the Federation, and the rates which should be paid were fixed. He served for quite a while, but not until the new United States Congress came into being.

I have examined very carefully the debates of the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention of 1787 to see what was said about a postal department. I examined three different plans. All of them contained the power of the legislature to establish post offices.

There was not a word of debate in the Constitutional Convention on that subject. Not even Madison, who kept pretty full notes, had anything to say except with respect to the vote. There was no contest whatever over that provision of the Constitution. It is now found in clause 7 of section 8 of article I, which enumerates various powers of the Congress, and provides that the Congress shall have power to establish post offices and post roads. Madison does refer to the fact that Benjamin Franklin offered an amendment to "post offices" so as to add "and post roads." That amendment carried by a vote of 6 States to 5, which was pretty close. The Founding Fathers did not want Congress to get into road building, but they let that provision get by.

James Madison then offered another amendment, to add the words "and canals when deemed necessary." That received the votes of only two States, so it lost.

So we inherited a socialistic enterprise, but it was supposed to be a revenue producer—and it was a revenue producer. Then we came to the first session of the First Congress. This is what was enacted into law on the 22d of September 1799, when the President approved the following bill, which had been passed by the First Congress of the United States:

That there shall be appointed a Postmaster General; his powers and his salary, (b) and the compensation to the assistant or a clerk and deputies which he may appoint, and the regulations of the Post Office shall be the same as they last were under the resolutions and ordinances of the late Congress. The Postmaster General to be subject

to the direction of the President of the United States in performing the duties of his office, and in forming contracts for the transportation of the mail.

The rates which were put into effect represented a tremendous reduction from what they had been. This was in 1789. The rates were as follows: Up to 30 miles, 6 cents; 30 to 80 miles, 10 cents; 80 to 150 miles, 12 cents per sheet; 150 to 400 miles, 18¢ cents; over 400 miles, 25 cents. That is the way postal rates started out.

It was not long before question arose as to what the power to establish post offices meant and question also arose as to what the power to establish post roads meant.

I turned to the annotated Constitution to find how many decisions had been made under this section of the Constitution. If I recall, there were only three of them.

One dealt with the right of Congress to appropriate funds to that section of the Cumberland toll road in Pennsylvania which was used as a post road. The Court upheld that appropriation.

The next one arose over an effort by Congress to build a bridge on a toll road. The Court turned that effort down. The Court held that Congress did not have the right to build a bridge.

Today we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on roads, and we are being asked to undertake a \$101 billion road-building program. All of it dates back to that one decision dealing with the Cumberland toll road under the constitutional authority establishing post offices and post roads. Under that decision, Congress was authorized to contribute to the upkeep of a toll road in Pennsylvania. That is the only constitutional authority for the road building we have done since and are planning to do today.

Then the question arose as to whether Congress could actually build a post office. The Government started condemnation proceedings in Cincinnati, Ohio. A man by the name of Kohl objected. That case was decided in *Kohl v. U. S.*

(91 U. S. 367). It was decided in 1876. The court held that Congress had the right to condemn land and to build post offices. That principle has not been challenged since that time.

It was not until 1845 that Congress found it needed to protect the postal revenue by declaring a monopoly over first-class mail. Other people were cutting in, and were delivering mail in cities for very much less than the Government was charging. That practice was reducing the Government's revenue, and, so, in 1845 Congress passed a law which declared that practice to be illegal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement dealing with section 9 of the act of March 3, 1845.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On September 22, 1789, the President approved the following bill which had been passed by the First Congress of the United States:

"That there shall be appointed a Postmaster General; his powers and salary, (b) and the compensation to the assistant or clerk and deputies which he may appoint, and the regulations of the post office shall be the same as they last were under the resolutions and ordinances of the late Congress. The Postmaster General to be subject to the direction of the President of the United States in performing the duties of his office, and in forming contracts for the transportation of the mail.

"SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That this act shall continue in force until the end of the next session of Congress, and no longer."

It was not until March 3, 1845, that the President approved an act of Congress, the title of which was: "An act to reduce the rates of postage, to limit the use and correct the abuse of the franking privilege, and for the prevention of frauds on the revenues of the Post Office Department." Section 9 of that act, which for the first time by legislative action gave the Government a legal monopoly of carrying the mails, reads as follows:

"SEC. 9. And be it further enacted, That it shall not be lawful for any person or persons

to establish any private express or expresses for the conveyance, nor in any manner to cause to be conveyed, or provide for the conveyance or transportation by regular trips, or at stated periods or intervals, from one city, town, or other place, to any other city, town, or place in the United States, between and from and to which cities, towns, or other places the United States mail is regularly transported, under the authority of the Post Office Department, of any letters, packets, or packages of letters, or other matter properly transmittable in the United States mail, except newspapers, pamphlets, magazines, and periodicals; and each and every person offending against this provision, or aiding and assisting therein, or acting as such private express, shall, for each time any letter or letters, packet or packages, or other matter properly transmittable by mail, except newspapers, pamphlets, magazines, periodicals, shall or may be, by him, her, or them, or through his, her, or their means or instrumentality, in whole or in part, conveyed or transported, contrary to the true intent, spirit, and meaning of this section, forfeit and pay the sum of \$150."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have mentioned the fact that when the postal service was started in this country it was started for the purpose of producing revenue. I regret that we do not have statistics prior to 1837. There are several departmental reports stating that there was a surplus, but the reports do not state how large the surplus was. No figures are available.

Then Congress decided that it was not the purpose to operate the Post Office Department in order to obtain revenue. The purpose, it was said, was to have the post office pay its own way. That was the theory. It was to pay its own way.

A significant fact is that in the first year for which we have figures the Post Office produced a large revenue.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the statistics for the past 118 years of receipts and disbursements of the Post Office Department.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Post Office Department—Postal deficit since 1837

| Fiscal year | Revenues    | Expenses    | Surplus   | Deficit   | Fiscal year | Revenues     | Expenses     | Surplus     | Deficit     |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1837        | \$4,101,703 | \$3,288,319 | \$813,384 |           | 1869        | \$17,314,176 | \$23,677,913 |             | \$6,363,737 |
| 1838        | 4,238,733   | 4,430,662   |           | \$191,929 | 1870        | 18,879,537   | 23,977,391   |             | 5,097,854   |
| 1839        | 4,484,657   | 4,636,536   |           | 151,879   | 1871        | 20,037,045   | 24,395,798   |             | 4,358,753   |
| 1840        | 4,543,522   | 4,718,236   |           | 174,714   | 1872        | 21,915,426   | 26,664,520   |             | 4,749,094   |
| 1841        | 4,407,726   | 4,499,687   |           | 91,961    | 1873        | 22,996,742   | 29,125,635   |             | 6,128,893   |
| 1842        | 4,546,850   | 5,671,063   |           | 1,124,213 | 1874        | 26,471,072   | 32,228,980   |             | 5,757,908   |
| 1843        | 4,296,225   | 4,374,845   |           | 78,620    | 1875        | 26,791,314   | 33,611,634   |             | 6,820,320   |
| 1844        | 4,237,288   | 4,298,628   |           | 61,340    | 1876        | 28,644,198   | 33,291,451   |             | 4,647,253   |
| 1845        | 4,289,842   | 4,326,692   |           | 36,850    | 1877        | 27,531,585   | 33,658,941   |             | 6,127,356   |
| 1846        | 3,487,199   | 4,120,518   |           | 633,319   | 1878        | 29,277,517   | 34,182,546   |             | 4,905,029   |
| 1847        | 3,880,309   | 4,081,128   |           | 200,819   | 1879        | 30,041,983   | 33,457,915   |             | 3,415,932   |
| 1848        | 4,555,211   | 4,380,459   |           | 174,752   | 1880        | 33,315,479   | 36,537,433   |             | 3,221,954   |
| 1849        | 4,705,176   | 4,477,664   |           | 227,512   | 1881        | 36,785,398   | 39,607,357   |             | 2,821,959   |
| 1850        | 5,499,985   | 5,213,244   |           | 286,741   | 1882        | 41,876,410   | 40,622,486   | \$1,253,924 |             |
| 1851        | 6,410,604   | 6,278,710   |           | 131,894   | 1883        | 45,508,693   | 43,327,340   | 2,181,353   |             |
| 1852        | 5,184,627   | 7,107,550   |           |           | 1884        | 43,325,959   | 47,233,016   |             | 3,907,057   |
| 1853        | 5,240,725   | 7,983,090   |           |           | 1885        | 42,560,844   | 50,042,254   |             | 7,481,410   |
| 1854        | 6,255,586   | 8,608,286   |           |           | 1886        | 43,948,423   | 51,016,918   |             | 7,068,495   |
| 1855        | 6,642,136   | 9,968,992   |           |           | 1887        | 48,837,609   | 52,982,627   |             | 4,145,018   |
| 1856        | 6,920,822   | 10,407,868  |           |           | 1888        | 52,695,177   | 56,467,643   |             | 3,772,466   |
| 1857        | 7,353,952   | 11,507,670  |           |           | 1889        | 56,175,611   | 62,344,715   |             | 6,169,104   |
| 1858        | 7,486,793   | 12,721,637  |           |           | 1890        | 60,882,098   | 66,282,863   |             | 5,400,765   |
| 1859        | 7,968,484   | 11,457,513  |           |           | 1891        | 65,931,786   | 73,082,395   |             | 7,150,609   |
| 1860        | 8,518,067   | 19,170,606  |           |           | 1892        | 70,930,476   | 77,041,452   |             | 6,110,976   |
| 1861        | 8,349,296   | 13,601,263  |           |           | 1893        | 75,896,933   | 81,613,722   |             | 5,716,789   |
| 1862        | 8,299,821   | 11,125,965  |           |           | 1894        | 75,080,479   | 85,057,995   |             | 9,977,516   |
| 1863        | 11,163,790  | 11,306,415  |           |           | 1895        | 76,983,128   | 87,213,570   |             | 10,230,442  |
| 1864        | 12,438,254  | 12,843,068  |           |           | 1896        | 82,499,208   | 90,943,410   |             | 8,444,202   |
| 1865        | 14,556,159  | 13,638,909  | 917,250   |           | 1897        | 82,665,463   | 94,097,042   |             | 11,431,579  |
| 1866        | 14,386,986  | 15,320,837  |           | 933,851   | 1898        | 89,012,619   | 98,067,171   |             | 9,054,552   |
| 1867        | 15,237,027  | 19,209,378  |           | 3,972,351 | 1899        | 95,021,384   | 101,651,520  |             | 6,630,136   |
| 1868        | 16,292,601  | 22,837,949  |           | 6,545,348 | 1900        | 102,354,579  | 107,764,937  |             | 5,410,358   |

## Post Office Department—Postal deficit since 1837—Continued

| Fiscal year | Revenues      | Expenses      | Surplus    | Deficit     | Fiscal year                    | Revenues      | Expenses      | Surplus      | Deficit       |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|------------|-------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| 1901        | \$111,631,193 | \$115,612,714 |            | \$3,981,521 | 1931                           | \$656,463,383 | \$802,529,573 |              | \$146,066,190 |
| 1902        | 121,848,047   | 124,800,217   |            | 2,951,170   | 1932                           | 588,171,923   | 703,722,534   |              | 205,550,611   |
| 1903        | 134,224,443   | 138,811,420   |            | 4,586,977   | 1933                           | 587,631,364   | 700,006,256   |              | 112,374,892   |
| 1904        | 143,582,624   | 152,395,394   |            | 8,812,770   | 1934                           | 586,733,166   | 630,767,001   |              | 44,033,835    |
| 1905        | 152,826,585   | 167,420,972   |            | 14,594,387  | 1935                           | 630,795,302   | 696,603,253   |              | 65,807,951    |
| 1906        | 167,932,783   | 178,475,725   |            | 10,542,942  | 1936                           | 665,343,357   | 753,659,681   |              | 88,316,324    |
| 1907        | 183,585,006   | 190,277,037   |            | 6,692,031   | 1937                           | 726,201,110   | 772,815,842   |              | 46,614,732    |
| 1908        | 191,478,663   | 208,388,942   |            | 16,910,279  | 1938                           | 728,634,051   | 772,445,607   |              | 43,811,556    |
| 1909        | 203,562,383   | 221,042,154   |            | 17,479,771  | 1939                           | 745,955,075   | 784,646,939   |              | 38,691,864    |
| 1910        | 224,128,658   | 230,010,140   |            | 5,881,482   | 1940                           | 766,948,627   | 807,732,866   |              | 40,784,239    |
| 1911        | 237,879,824   | 237,660,706   | \$219,118  |             | 1941                           | 812,827,736   | 836,945,548   |              | 24,117,812    |
| 1912        | 246,744,016   | 248,529,539   |            | 1,785,523   | 1942                           | 859,817,491   | 873,956,528   |              | 14,139,037    |
| 1913        | 266,619,526   | 262,108,874   | 4,510,652  |             | 1943                           | 966,227,289   | 952,535,379   | \$13,691,910 |               |
| 1914        | 287,934,566   | 283,558,102   | 4,376,464  |             | 1944                           | 1,112,877,174 | 1,068,985,619 | 43,891,555   |               |
| 1915        | 287,248,165   | 298,581,474   |            | 11,333,309  | 1945                           | 1,314,240,132 | 1,145,101,185 | 169,138,947  |               |
| 1916        | 312,057,089   | 306,228,453   | 5,829,236  |             | 1946                           | 1,224,572,173 | 1,372,655,008 |              | 148,082,835   |
| 1917        | 329,726,116   | 319,889,904   | 9,836,212  |             | 1947                           | 1,290,141,041 | 1,574,008,673 |              | 274,867,632   |
| 1918        | 388,975,962   | 324,849,188   | 64,126,774 |             | 1948                           | 1,410,971,284 | 1,754,893,289 |              | 343,922,005   |
| 1919        | 436,239,126   | 362,504,275   | 73,734,851 |             | 1949                           | 1,571,851,202 | 2,163,380,730 |              | 591,529,528   |
| 1920        | 437,150,212   | 454,420,695   |            | 17,270,483  | 1950                           | 1,677,486,967 | 2,267,069,182 |              | 589,582,215   |
| 1921        | 463,491,275   | 621,008,963   |            | 157,517,688 | 1951                           | 1,776,816,354 | 2,328,327,570 |              | 551,511,216   |
| 1922        | 484,853,541   | 545,668,942   |            | 60,815,401  | 1952                           | 1,947,316,280 | 2,674,366,498 |              | 727,050,218   |
| 1923        | 532,827,925   | 556,893,128   |            | 24,065,203  | 1953                           | 2,091,714,112 | 2,710,225,753 |              | 618,511,641   |
| 1924        | 572,948,778   | 587,412,753   |            | 14,463,977  | 1954                           | 2,268,516,717 | 2,667,663,483 |              | 399,146,766   |
| 1925        | 599,591,478   | 639,336,505   |            | 39,745,027  |                                |               |               |              |               |
| 1926        | 659,819,801   | 679,792,180   |            | 19,972,379  |                                |               |               |              |               |
| 1927        | 683,121,989   | 714,628,189   |            | 31,506,200  |                                |               |               |              |               |
| 1928        | 693,633,921   | 725,755,017   |            | 32,121,096  |                                |               |               |              |               |
| 1929        | 696,947,578   | 782,408,754   |            | 85,461,176  |                                |               |               |              |               |
| 1930        | 705,484,098   | 803,700,085   |            | 98,215,987  |                                |               |               |              |               |
|             |               |               |            |             | Cumulative surplus or deficit. |               |               | 395,342,520  | 6,043,932,258 |
|             |               |               |            |             | Net cumulative deficit.        |               |               |              | 5,648,589,729 |

NOTE.—Expenses, 1946 to date, are obligations chargeable to those years, including adjustments for retroactive rate increases to railroads for fiscal years 1947 through 1951. Expenses shown prior to 1946 are expenditures made during those years and include some expenditures chargeable to other years.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to several significant facts in the statement I have inserted in the RECORD. In 1837 the receipts of the Post Office Department amounted to about 16 percent of the total receipts of the Government, which were only \$25 million. In that year the Government spent \$37 million and had a deficit of \$12 million. Yet the Post Office Department showed a surplus of \$813,384.

The Post Office Department not only operated the postal service, but supplied about 6 percent of all the money expended by the Government, except by the Army and the Navy. Those were big dollars in those days, Mr. President. It is said to be a dollar of that kind that George Washington threw across the Potomac. We are told a dollar went further in those days. It was a big dollar. The total revenue received by the Government was \$25 million, and the Post Office Department produced 16 percent of it.

Then the receipts started to go down, or rather, I should say, the costs started to go up. The costs started to go up much faster than the receipts. In 1848, 1849, and 1850 the Post Office Department had tremendous surpluses. In the last year of the War Between the States the surplus was \$917,250. Soldiers were writing home and everybody was writing to the soldiers, and there was a large surplus produced by first-class mail. That is always a revenue-producing service. It is producing a handsome profit now. The heavy loss comes on second-class mail, on junk mail, and, to some extent, on fourth-class mail, which is parcel post, although the loss from that category has been reduced.

I wish to call attention to the statistics I have inserted in the RECORD by pointing out that the large postal deficits started in fiscal 1946. In fiscal 1945, which was a war year, the surplus was \$169,138,947. The next year the deficit was \$148 million-plus. The defi-

cit continued to rise until fiscal 1952, when it reached the enormous sum of \$727,050,218.

The cumulative deficit of a Government monopoly, which had been established to make a profit, is today \$5,648,589,729.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia is a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which considers post-office appropriations. The Senate and the Post Office Department are fortunate that he is in that position, because he has profound knowledge of postal matters, as is evidenced by his very fine statement.

I wish to ask the Senator to tell us, if he can, what the anticipated deficit of the Post Office Department will be at the end of fiscal 1955.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Postmaster General testified before the subcommittee this week that, on the basis of the passage of a 7.6-percent salary bill, the deficit would be \$455 million, and on the basis of a 10-percent salary bill, the deficit would be \$505 million. We should bear in mind the fact that we must temper our love and affection and generosity for our postal workers with a sense of justice to those who must pay the bills. Every dollar of pay raise will have to be paid in borrowed dollars, on which the taxpayers must pay interest for an indefinite period.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am sure that the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia entertains the same view I do with respect to the postal deficit. We are concerned about it, and we are concerned about its continued growth. I firmly believe that the Post Office Department is a service organization, and therefore a certain percent of the cost should be

borne by the taxpayers. However, when that figure begins to exceed \$150 million or \$200 million, we are getting to the point where the users of the postal service should at least carry the cost.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia believes that, while we need not put such a provision in this bill, we should certainly at this session take action in compliance with the President's very urgent request in his budget message of last January, when he asked us to provide \$400 million of additional revenue for the Post Office Department. He said if we did that, the deficit of the Post Office Department for the next fiscal year would amount to \$25 million.

Of course, Mr. President, the deficit includes many subsidies. Let us be frank. We carry mail free for the blind—and I am glad of that—and we give to religious and fraternal orders a cut rate on their literature, books, and what not. There are many subsidies involved. I suppose they should be identified, but, in any event, we should try to balance each year the budget of the Post Office Department. It was never intended to be an instrumentality for a broad program of subsidization or to be operated, merely because it was a function performed by the Government, without regard to the cost.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator will well remember that last year a postal pay increase bill was passed by both Houses, but was vetoed by the President because he felt at that time that provision for postal rate increases should be a part of that particular piece of legislation. I did not share that view. I do not think the salaries of postal employees should be determined by the Post Office deficit, but, on the other hand, I do not think we can continue to build up postal deficits.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I voted for the 5-percent increase and regretted that the President vetoed the bill. It now ap-

pears, hindsight being a little better than foresight, that that bill would have been cheaper than is the one we are now considering.

Mr. CARLSON. That bill would have cost \$130 million, and I think the bill before the Senate at this time will cost \$160 million. The Senate bill does not contain provisions for reclassification. If it did, it would cost many more millions of dollars.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, but for the lateness of the hour I should like to go into further detail regarding the history of the Post Office Department, but I must hurry on to a discussion of the measure on which we are going to vote.

There are two proposals. One provides a 10-percent increase for all postal workers, to be followed by a similar increase, as I understand, for all classified civil-service workers.

We have, also, the Carlson bill. I wish to mention reclassification, because it gave me considerable concern until I found out the facts. I received many letters protesting against it, and reached the conclusion that it must be pretty bad because the great majority of the writers opposed it. A few favored it. I found out in reading the debate on the House side on a bill which is the same as the Carlson bill that there had been attached to that bill 20 amendments which eliminated all the bona fide and serious objections.

Can we reclassify an employee and cut his salary? We cannot do so and make him like it. He can appeal to the Civil Service Commission, and its decision is final and binding on the Post Office Department.

For fear that the Post Office Department might turn things topsy-turvy, the bill authorizes the reclassification of approximately 10 percent of the postal employees. There is no doubt that reclassification is overdue. There are 20 safeguards. I do not have time to mention all 20 of them, but they have been thrown around reclassification. I am satisfied that if the persons who have written me had it explained to them, they would withdraw their objections to reclassification.

That brings us, Mr. President, to the final decision as to what percentage of increase we should support. I have been for 22 years a consistent friend of the postal workers. I should like to give them as much as we can afford to give them, but I am firmly convinced that if we go above 7.6 percent the President will veto the bill. If he should veto it, I could hold out to my friends in Virginia no assurance that when they asked me for bread I did not give them a stone in voting for a 10 percent bill. I could give them no assurance whatever that the President's veto of a 10 percent bill could be overridden in both branches of the Congress.

We have an unbalanced budget, which gives me grave concern, and there is a growing trend toward inflation which Mr. Bernard Baruch expressed so potently before our committee last Wednesday, when he said, "Above everything else, if you want to control the stock

market, have a sound fiscal policy, and control inflation."

Mr. President, I asked the Postmaster General to give me statistics analyzing the Carlson bill. I have his reply which was sent by special messenger today. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statistics furnished to me by the Post Office Department.

There being no objection, the statement of statistics was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here are the facts:

Since 1945, the cost of living has advanced 48.6 percent.

Since 1945, the starting salary for clerks and letter carriers has been increased by 92 percent, from \$1,700 in 1945 to \$3,270 at present. S. 1489 would make this increase 114 percent (\$3,640).

Since 1945, the top salary for clerks and carriers has increased by 94 percent, from \$2,100 to \$4,070. (This does not include longevity payments of \$100 each at the end of 13, 18 and 25 years of service.) S. 1489 would increase the top rate to \$4,360, or 108 percent.

The clerk or carrier working for the Department in 1945 at \$1,700 will earn \$4,360 upon passage of S. 1489, an increase in basic salary of 156 percent.

Since July 1951, when clerks and letter carriers were given a salary increase of \$400 a year, the cost of living has increased slightly more than 3 percent. The salary increase provided in S. 1489 averages 7½ percent, with a minimum increase of 6 percent.

Upon approval of a supplemental appropriation now pending in the Congress, letter carriers will also receive a \$100 tax-free uniform allowance.

According to the BLS Occupational Wage Survey, 1954, a class A accounting clerk in private industry earns \$3,432 in Boston and \$4,290 in Cleveland. If this position were in the postal field service it would be allocated to salary level 6 in S. 1489, and would pay \$3,880 to \$4,630 a year.

A truckdriver in Boston, according to the same survey, is paid \$3,390 per year; in Atlanta and Memphis he is paid \$2,558; in Cleveland he is paid \$4,243. Under S. 1489 he would be paid \$3,640 to \$4,360.

A janitor in Boston in private industry earns \$2,683 a year; in Memphis he receives \$2,018; in Cleveland and Chicago he receives \$3,182. S. 1489 will pay janitors \$2,870 to \$3,470 a year.

A guard or watchman in a private industrial plant in New York in 1954 was earning \$2,870 to \$3,245. The Post Office Department will pay its guards and watchmen under S. 1489 from \$3,330 to \$3,990 a year.

According to the Municipal Yearbook, 1954, a truckdriver working for the city government is paid \$3,744 in Philadelphia and \$4,243 in Milwaukee. The Post Office Department under S. 1489 would pay \$3,640 to \$4,360.

An automobile mechanic receives \$4,098 from the city of Philadelphia, \$4,576 in Milwaukee, and \$4,909 in San Francisco. S. 1489 would pay \$3,880 to \$4,630.

A junior clerk-typist receives \$2,723 from the city of Philadelphia, \$3,360 in Milwaukee, and \$3,840 in San Francisco. S. 1489 would pay \$3,330 to \$3,990.

The Carlson substitute bill would give an increase to city letter carriers averaging 8.2 percent—and to the lowest grade letter carriers of 11.3 percent.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when the Members of Congress read this statistical analysis showing how the increases are to be made and then compare the increases, as the Postmaster General

did, with wages paid in comparable employment in private industry, I do not see how anyone can say that we are being unfair to the postal employees. Of course, we are not so generous as we would be if we gave them a 10 percent increase in salaries.

For the reasons I have enumerated, Mr. President, and because the hour is growing late and I do not wish unduly to detain my colleagues, especially the very distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] who is scheduled to speak after I have concluded, I wish to say, in conclusion, that it is my honest opinion that Congress would be well advised for the time being to support the Carlson proposal of a 7.6 percent increase, with reclassification, and then next year, if we shall be in better fiscal shape, if the Congress thinks there should be another increase of 2 or 3 percent, we can grant it then. But for the time being I say I cannot feel that I should go further than the 7.6 percent increase, and I honestly think I have taken a position best calculated to put some actual cash into the pockets of those who need it.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

#### PROPOSED PEACE CODE FOR THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have read, with appreciation and approval, of the proposal by the Government of Israel, through Ambassador Abba Eban in the Security Council, that Egypt join with Israel in a peace code for the Middle East.

I consider this to be the first constructive proposal I have heard in many months to deal frontally with the tragic tensions which now exist between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

The American people desire, above all, to see the Middle Eastern tensions allayed. They desire to see constructive steps taken in the direction of peace, understanding, and cooperation between Israel and her neighbors. We are as concerned with the welfare of the people of Egypt as we are with that of the inhabitants of Israel. The welfare of both peoples can best be served—can be served only—by settlements and understandings which will facilitate common and cooperative efforts to resolve the political and economic problems of the Middle East.

If the Egyptian Government would agree to give sober and sympathetic consideration to the Israeli proposals and enter into negotiations concerning them—as was envisioned in the Rhodes Agreements of 1949—the free world will have reason to rejoice.

I am convinced that the people of both Israel and Egypt desire an end to the tragic incidents of recent months, and the threat to world peace which those incidents—all of them collectively—continue to pose.

The Government of Egypt can assume its rightful role of leadership among the Arab peoples, by giving concrete evidence that Egypt accepts the existence of Israel within her present boundaries and is prepared to move forward to a

normalization of relations between Egypt and Israel. Such a step would help, in my judgment, to break the unhappy stalemate which now exists in that area. It would, of course, bring an end to the violent incidents—to the raids and killings—which now occur almost daily along the Egyptian-Israeli border.

Thirty killings occurring over a period of weeks are no less tragic than a similar number occurring in one bloody clash.

Even while the Security Council is weighing Egyptian charges against Israel, the press reports a new condemnation of Egypt by the mixed armistice commission, on the basis of a violation of the Israeli borders by Egypt.

I ask unanimous consent that a press report of the incident I have just referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ARMISTICE UNIT BLAMES EGYPT

JERUSALEM, March 23.—The Egyptian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission placed on Egypt today the responsibility for blowing up an Israeli command car close to the Gaza Strip last Friday night.

The commission adopted an Israeli resolution with these findings:

Two trained men crossed during the night from Egyptian-held territory into Israel and planted a mine on a track used by routine security patrols of Israel.

As a result a command car in which 4 Israeli soldiers were riding was blown up, lightly wounding the soldiers and knocking parts of the vehicle 75 yards away.

Egypt was called upon to terminate immediately all aggressive acts against Israel.

Meanwhile Edward B. Lawson, the United States Ambassador, assured two leaders of the Rabbinical Council of America that the United States would never tolerate any violation of the integrity of the current boundaries of Israel.

The two religious heads were Rabbis David B. Hollander, president of the Rabbinical Council, and Hershel Schachter, chairman of the Israeli committee of the council.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, we all recognize that there are many difficulties in the way of a settlement of all outstanding problems between Egypt and Israel. These difficulties must be surmounted, one by one. The separate points of tension and controversy need to be resolved, each on its own merits.

There is the problem of the refugees, many of whom are now quartered, inadequately and unhappily, in the Gaza Strip in Egypt. There is the matter of the Suez Canal and the right of Israeli vessels to transit the canal without interruption.

These are but a few of the problems existing between Egypt and Israel.

Both Egypt and Israel must be willing to meet each other half way, to negotiate, and to reach agreements. I feel certain Israel is so disposed. I hope that Egypt will be likewise disposed.

Surely all the nations of the free world, including the United States, would be ready to contribute to the resolution of as many of these problems as possible. It is to the essential interest of the free world that peace be established and maintained in the Middle East.

The United States Government, for its part, must and should give its full support to the Israeli proposal for a peace code. The United States Government should use all its persuasive power upon Egypt to accept this proposal as a basis for negotiation.

Our Government can do a great deal which it is not now doing. Our Government should be moving with full force and vigor to rescue Israel from the isolation which now engulfs her in the Middle East. We should be pushing the excellent Johnson plan for the joint development and use of the Jordan River basin. By bringing the nations—all the nations—in the Middle East together, by helping to establish a common front among them, to the maximum extent possible, we shall thereby advance the cause of Middle Eastern security, and consequently, of free world security.

The peace and security of the free world are, of course, the highest goals of American foreign policy.

The bringing of peace to the troubled Middle East would constitute one of the greatest achievements of our diplomacy. We must exert our utmost effort to accomplish it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a news article appearing in this morning's New York Times, reporting the Israeli proposal of a peace code with Egypt.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ISRAEL BIDS EGYPT JOIN IN PEACE CODE—EBAN ASKS FOR RENUNCIATION OF "USELESS HOSTILITY" IN SECURITY COUNCIL TALK

(By Kathleen Teltsch)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., March 23.—Israel asked Egypt today to renounce "useless hostility" and join her in a code for peace in the Middle East.

The Israeli Government, Abba Eban declared in the Security Council, stands ready to give "an assurance that if no hostile act is carried out by Egypt against Israel, then no hostile act of any kind will be carried out by Israel against Egypt."

The offer was made in Israel's first answer to Egypt's demands that Israel be condemned and punished for launching an attack last month near Gaza. Thirty-eight Egyptians and 8 Israelis were slain in the clash. Israel has insisted—and Mr. Eban today stressed this stand—that for months before the Gaza episode, Egypt stepped up assaults across the border, sabotage, spying and infiltration.

There was no reply from Omar Loutfi, Egypt's delegate, to Israel's invitation. Instead, he reiterated Egypt's argument that Israel sought to "drown out" the Gaza incident by bringing in a flood of countercharges.

The Egyptian spokesman briefly took issue with the report made last week by the United Nations' Palestine truce chief. In a restrained tone, he objected that Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns had gone "far beyond" his instructions to report on the Gaza case.

General Burns had informed the council that Israel was blamed for opening an attack on Egyptian military installations. However, he had said also that increased infiltration from Egypt had been "one of the main causes" of increased border tensions.

Mr. Eban, in setting out Israel's case, made only passing reference to the Gaza clash, observing that "regrettable serious

loss of life" had occurred. He did not mention Israel's original argument that Egypt had opened fire on Israel and that in the skirmish Israeli forces had crossed the border.

The Israeli delegate charged, however, that Egyptian aims to wrest the Negev from Israel were at the root of Egypt's stepped-up policy by harassment of Israeli pioneer settlements in the Negev area.

"Let me say that Egypt or any other Arab state will not get the Negev, nor is our territory available for bargaining," he declared, in a reference to a recent Egyptian statement indicating the return of the Negev might be the price for Cairo's joining in a Middle East pact.

Mr. Eban, in his hour-long speech, ignored Egypt's demand last week that the council invoke sanctions against Israel—an unlikely prospect, it is agreed here—and also ask reparations for the loss of life and damage at Gaza. He dwelt mainly on a recital of border violations by Egypt—he enumerated 21 in detail—and on the offer for a peace code.

#### KEYSTONE OF MIDEAST PEACE

By cooperation, he insisted, Egypt and Israel could become the keystone of Middle East peace.

As steps toward this end, he urged that Cairo agree to proclaim the abolition of the state of war and to uphold the 1949 armistice agreement signed by both sides on the island of Rhodes.

The Egyptian delegate charged that the Israeli statement was full of "omissions, and inaccuracies" and had avoided mentioning the "brutal Gaza attack." His theme was that Israel's countercharges were mainly a recital of minor frontier troubles that, unlike the Gaza case, did not threaten peace in the Middle East.

He held also that the Burns report indicated that conditions along the border had been tranquil and that this disproved Israel's claim of a crisis created by Egypt.

The time has come, he declared, for the Council to heed its responsibility and see that no similar aggression by Israel occurs again. Egypt and all Arab states, he added, await this action.

#### THE PASSING OF PAUL V. McNUTT AND JOHN W. DAVIS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this has been a melancholy day for America, a day on which we lost two of our great statesmen.

The wires have just carried the sad news of the death of John W. Davis, my party's candidate for the presidency in 1924. Earlier in the day we learned of the passing of Paul V. McNutt, who headed the World War II Manpower Commission and served both as High Commissioner to the Philippines and as Ambassador to the Philippines.

The loss of either of these men would be a sad blow to any country. The loss of both is more than doubly distressing.

In recent years they have been living almost in retirement. But they were available with wise counsel and advice whenever they were called upon.

I was a friend of Paul V. McNutt, who was somewhat nearer my generation. I had many contacts with him during World War II, and my association and friendship were rewarding.

John William Davis was raised in the great American legal tradition. He was one of our most distinguished legal minds, and his contributions to American thought were direct and significant.

Death has ended two distinguished careers—political, diplomatic, and legal. But their families can rest secure in the thought that they have left behind them enduring monuments that will strengthen America throughout the ages.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### RECESS TO 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the order previously agreed to by the Senate, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, March 25, 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 24 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Burma, vice William J. Sebald, resigned.

Joseph E. Jacobs, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

##### UNITED NATIONS

John M. Allison, of Nebraska, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

##### COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Joseph S. Davis, of California, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Raymond J. Saulnier, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1955

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by Mr. COOPER, Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The clerk read as follows:

MARCH 24, 1955.

I hereby designate the Honorable JERE COOPER to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### PRAYER

Rev. Albert P. Shirkey, D. D., minister, Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we are thankful indeed that we are a part of this great and mighty Nation upheld by Thee, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Teach us how to erase from our national life the feeling that some men, because of their race, color, class, condition, or creed, are looked upon as superior while other men are counted inferior.

Bless our labors in the fields of religion and education, in health and welfare, in business and political life so that equal opportunities shall be extended to all.

Above our Nation is the flag our fathers, by great sacrifice, have raised up. Through zeal and devotion may we, their sons, keep it up.

God bless our President, our Congress, our judges, and every citizen so that, walking forward against all tyranny with faith in God and confidence in each other, we shall help to usher in a true and lasting peace and build a brotherhood of which we shall not be ashamed. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 691. An act to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 877 at Baytown, Tex., and certain tank cars.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday to file a privileged report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Saturday to file a privileged report on the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

#### IN MEMORY AND HONOR OF MITCHELL RED CLOUD, JR.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoon, March 23, the body of a gallant American soldier will be interred in the soil of his native land. Final burial services will be held on this date for Army Cpl. Mitchell Red Cloud, Jr., in the Decorah Cemetery near Black River Falls, Wis.

It is with a sense of deep humility that I pay respects to the memory of Mitchell Red Cloud, Jr., who was killed in action in Korea in 1950. He was a great soldier as the citation testifies in his posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor. He served our country with honor and distinction in two wars.

Mitchell left high school as a junior in 1941 to enlist in the Marine Corps. During World War II he fought in the Battles of Midway and Guadalcanal. He also served with the famed Carlson's Raiders of the 1st Marine Division.

The strapping young Winnebago Indian who left Jackson County weighing 195 pounds returned to the Indian mission a mere 115 pounds. His impairment in health came about as a result of contracting malaria during his service in the South Pacific. After he recovered his health, he joined the Army in 1948.

When the Korean crisis came to a head on June 25, 1950, with the invasion of South Korea by North Korean troops and our country spearheaded U. N. defense of South Korea, Mitchell Red Cloud's unit was one of those assigned to Korea. Less than 5 months after the outbreak of the Korean war he was killed in action near Chonghyon, Korea, on November 5, 1950.

The official Army citation for the Congressional Medal of Honor—which was posthumously presented by Gen. Omar Bradley to Mitchell's mother, Mrs. Nellie Red Cloud, at the Pentagon on April 3, 1951—eloquently tells the story of Mitchell's bravery on November 5, 1950. Here is the story of this gallant Winnebago Indian's heroism as chronicled in the citation:

Cpl. Mitchell Red Cloud, Jr., Company E, 19th Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Chonghyon, Korea, on November 5, 1950. From his position on the point of a ridge immediately in front of the company command post he was the first to detect the approach of the Chinese Communist forces and give the alarm as the enemy charged from a brush-covered area less than 100 feet from him. Springing up he delivered devastating point-blank automatic rifle fire